



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

अंक: 54	शिमला, शनिवार, 29 अप्रैल, 2006/9 वैशाख, 1928	संख्या: 5
	विषय सूची	
भाग-1	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि	142 147 तथा 170 171
भाग-2	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अधिकांशों और जिना मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि	147 153
भाग-3	अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनैन्शियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर-पब्लिक-इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि	153—156
भाग-4	स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाऊन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग	—
भाग-5	वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन	156 170
भाग-6	भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन	—
भाग-7	भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं	—
	अनुपूरक	—

29 अप्रैल, 2006/9 वैशाख, 1928 को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित बिजलिया 'प्रसाधारण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुई :

विज्ञप्ति की संख्या	विभाग का नाम	विषय
संख्या पर० (एपी-बी) डी (8)-4/2001, दिनांक 3 अप्रैल, 2006.	कार्मिक विभाग (निगुनित-11)	हिमाचल प्रदेश अधीनस्थ सेवाएं चयन बोर्ड, हमीरपुर के प्रक्रिया और संचालन (प्रथम संशोधन) नियम, 2006 इसके प्राधिकृत संशेजी पाठ सहित ।
संख्या जी० ए० डी० सी० (पी० ए०) 4-1/2003, दिनांक 20 अप्रैल, 2006	सामान्य प्रशासन विभाग (संसदीय कार्य विभाग)	हिमाचल प्रदेश मन्त्रियों के यात्रा भत्ता (संशोधन) नियम, 2006 इसके प्राधिकृत संशेजी पाठ सहित ।

भाग-1 — वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट

Shimla, the 9/10th March, 2006

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla, the 8/10th March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-69/76-IV-4820. — In exercise of the powers under Article 235 of the Constitution of India read with Rule 14 of the H. P. Judicial Service Rules, 2004 and all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Hon'ble High Court is pleased to extend the superannuation age of Dr. J. N. Barowalia, a member of the H. P. Judicial Service in the cadre of District Judges, presently posted as Registrar (Rules), High Court of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla from 58 years to 60 years.

The officer will now retire on his attaining the age of 60 years.

BY ORDER OF THE HON'BLE
HIGH COURT OF H. P.

Sd. -

Registrar General.

Shimla, the 9/10th March, 2003

No. HHC/GAZ/14-182 87-I-4809. — Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of 11 days commuted leave w. e. f. 20-2-2006 to 2-3-2006 with permission to prefix special casual leave w. e. f. 6-2-2006 to 19-2-2006 in favour of Shri Rattan Singh, Civil Judge (Sr. Division)-cum-CJM. Shimla, H. P.

Certified that Shri Rattan Singh has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Rattan Singh would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge (Sr. Division)-cum-CJM. Shimla, H. P. but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 9/10th March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-131 82-III-4828. — Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 17 days earned leave w. e. f. 16-3-2006 to 1-4-2006 with permission to prefix gazetted holiday falling on 15-3-2006 and to suffix Sunday falling on 2-4-2006 in favour of Shri K. L. Sharma, District and Sessions Judge, Sirmour at Nahan.

Certified that Shri Sharma is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of District and Sessions Judge, Sirmour at Nahan, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 9/10th March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-211 95-I-4801. — Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of 5 days earned leave w. e. f. 17-12-2005 to 21-12-2005 in favour of Shri S. K. Chaudhary, District and Sessions Judge, Bilaspur, H. P.

Certified that Shri Chaudhary has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Chaudhary would have continued to hold the post of District and Sessions Judge, Bilaspur but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

No. HHC/Admn. 6 (23)/74-XII-4839. — Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under rule 1.26 of H. P. Financial Rules, 1971, Volume-I, is pleased to declare the Civil Judge (Sr. Division)-cum-CJM. Sirmour at Nahan as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Courts of District and Sessions Judge and Additional District and Sessions Judge, Sirmour at Nahan and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T. A. etc. in respect of class-II, III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid courts under Head "2014—Administration of Justice" during the leave period of Shri K. L. Sharma, District and Sessions Judge, Sirmour w. e. f. 16-3-2006 to 1-4-2006 with permission to prefix gazetted holiday falling on 15-3-2006 and to suffix Sunday falling on 2-4-2006 or until he returns from leave.

Shimla, the 10/13th March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-220/96-4914. — Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 15 days paternity leave w. e. f. 13-3-2006 to 27-3-2006 with permission to prefix Second Saturday and Sunday falling on 11th and 12th March, 2006 in favour of Shri Bhupesh Sharma, Civil Judge (Sr. Div.)-cum-ACJM, Sarkaghat, H. P.

Certified that Shri Sharma is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge (Sr. Division)-cum-ACJM, Sarkaghat, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 10/13th March, 2006.

No. HHC/Admn. 6 (23)/74-XIII-4905. — Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him, under rule 1.26 of H. P. Financial Rules, 1971, Volume-I is pleased to declare the Civil Judge (Junior Division)-cum-SDJM, Jogindernagar as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Court of Civil Judges (Senior Division)-cum-ACJM, Sarkaghat and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T. A. etc. in respect of Class-III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid court under Head "2014—Administration of Justice" during the paternity leave period of Shri Bhupesh Sharma, Civil Judge (Sr. Division)-cum-ACJM, Sarkaghat w. e. f. 13-3-2006 to 27-3-2006 with permission to prefix Second Saturday and Sunday falling on 11th and 12th March, 2006 or until he returns from leave.

Shimla, the 16th March, 2006

No. HHC/Admn. 3(183)/82-II-4986. — 5 days commuted leave on and with effect from 28-2-2006 to 4-3-2006 with permission to suffix Sunday falling on 5-3-2006 is hereby sanctioned, *ex-post-facto*, in favour of Shri Gopal Dass Sharma, Court Secretary of this Registry.

Certified that Shri Gopal Dass Sharma, Court Secretary has joined the same post and at the same station from where he had proceeded on leave after expiry of the above period.

Certified that Shri Gopal Dass Sharma would have continued to officiate the same post of Court Secretary but for his proceeding on leave.

Shimla, the 16th March, 2006

No. HHC/Admn. 3(45)/74-III-4992. — 2 days commuted leave on and with effect from 7-3-2006 to 8-3-2006 is hereby sanctioned, *ex-post-facto* in favour of Shri D. R. Verma, Assistant Registrar of this Registry.

Certified that Shri D. R. Verma, Assistant Registrar, has joined the same post and at the same station from where he had proceeded on leave after expiry of the above leave period.

Certified that Shri D. R. Verma would have continued to hold the same post of Assistant Registrar but for his proceeding on leave.

Shimla, the 16th March, 2006

No. HHC/Admn. 3(129)/78-1-4939.—5 days commuted leave on and with effect from 3-3-2006 to 7-3-2006 is hereby sanctioned, *ex-post-facto*, in favour of Shri K. L. Rawat, Court Secretary of this Registry.

Certified that Shri K. L. Rawat, Court Secretary has joined the same post and at the same station from where he had proceeded on leave after expiry of the above leave period.

Certified that Shri K. L. Rawat would have continued to hold the same post of Court Secretary but for his proceeding on leave.

Shimla, the 18th March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-157/84-II-5123-32.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 24 days earned leave *w.e.f.* 20-3-2006 to 12-4-2006 with permission to prefix Sunday falling on 19-3-2006 and to Suffix Local holiday, Gazetted holidays and Sunday falling from 13th to 16th April, 2006 in favour of Shri A. C. Thalwal, Civil Judge (Sr. Div.)-*cum*-CJM, Bilaspur, H. P.

Certified that Shri Thalwal is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Thalwal would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge (Sr. Division)-*cum*-CJM, Bilaspur, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 18/20th March, 2006

No. HHC/Admn. 6 (23)/74-XIII-5237.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under rule 1.26 of H. P. Financial Rules, 1971, Volume-I, is pleased to declare the Civil Judge (Jr. Division)-*cum*-JMJC Bilaspur as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Court of Civil Judge (Sr. Division)-*cum*-CJM, Bilaspur and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T. A. etc. in respect of Class-II, III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid Court under head "2014—Administration of Justice" during the earned leave period of Shri A. C. Thalwal, Civil Judge (Sr. Division)-*cum*-CJM, Bilaspur with effect from 20-3-2006 to 12-4-2006 with permission to prefix Sunday falling on 19-3-2006 and to suffix local holiday, gazetted holidays and Sunday falling from 13th to 16th April, 2006 or until he returns from leave.

Shimla, the 18/20th March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-134/82-III-5212.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of 4 days commuted leave *w.e.f.* 28-2-2006 to 3-3-2006 in favour of Shri Ravinder Parkash Verma, Addl. District and Session Judge, Una.

Certified that Shri Verma has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Verma would have continued to hold the post of Addl. District and Sessions Judge, Una but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 18/20th March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-257/2003-5219.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of

5 days earned leave *w.e.f.* 15-2-2006 to 19-2-2006 with permission to prefix special casual leave with effect from 23-1-2006 to 14-2-2006, in favour of Shri C. B. Barowalia, District and Sessions Judge, Kinnaur at Rampur Bushahr. This is in continuation of this Registry Notification of even number dated 7/9-1-2006.

Certified that Shri Barowalia has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Barowalia would have continued to hold the post of District and Sessions Judge, Kinnaur at Rampur Bushahr but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 18th March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-255/2002-5226.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to order the cancellation of 2 days un-availed earned leave with effect from 5-3-2006 to 6-3-2006, already sanctioned *vide* this Registry notification of even number dated 1-3-2006 in favour of Smt. Kanta Verma Civil Judge (Jr. Division)-*cum*-JMJC (II) Mandi, H. P.

Shimla, the 18th/23rd March, 2006

No. HHC/Admn. 16 (7) 74-III-5356.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice, in exercise of the powers vested in him u/s 139(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, u/s 297(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and Rule 4(v) of the H. P. Oath Commissioners (Appointment & Control) Rules, 1996 is pleased to appoint Shri Sher Singh, Advocate, Jawali, as Oath Commissioner at Jawali, H. P. for a period of two years with immediate effect, for administering oaths and affirmations on affidavits to the deponents, under the aforesaid Code and Rules.

Shimla, the 18th/23rd March, 2006

No. HHC/Admn. 16 (9) 74-VI-5345.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him u/s 139 (b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, U/S 297 (b) of the code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and Rule 4 (v) of the H. P. Oath Commissioners (Appointment & Control) Rules, 1996 is pleased to appoint Shri Prem Singh Advocate, Sundernagar, as Oath Commissioner at Sundernagar, H. P. for a period of two years, with immediate effect, for administering oaths and affirmations on affidavits to the deponents, under the aforesaid Codes and Rules.

Shimla, the 20th/23rd March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ/14-226 961-5 352.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to order the cancellation of 3 days un-availed earned leave with effect from 2-3-2006 to 4-3-2006, already sanctioned *vide* this Registry notification of even number dated 23/24-1-2006 in favour of Shri R. K. Tomar, Civil Judge (Sr. Div.)-*cum*-JMJC (I), Kangra H. P.

Shimla, the 20th/23rd March, 2006

No. HHC/GAZ 14-264/2003-5359.—In partial modification of this Registry Notification No. HHC/GAZ/14-264/2003-333-41, dated 3/4-1-2006, Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of 15 days earned leave with effect from 22-1-2006 to 5-2-2006 and 5 days commuted leave with effect from 6-2-2006 to 10-2-2006 with permission to suffix Second Saturday and Sunday fell on 11th & 12th February, 2006, in favour of Shri Rajinder Kumar, Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.)-*cum*-JMJC (II), Rohru.

Certified that Shri Rajinder Kumar has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Rajinder Kumar would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) cum-JMIC (II) Rohru, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order.

Sd/-
Registrar General.

Shimla, the 22nd March, 2006

No. HHC/15-29/Jus./Accts. 2005-538 5.—It is hereby notified that the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vijay Kumar Jhanji has relinquished the charge of the office of the Judge, High Court of Himachal Pradesh in the forenoon of 22nd March, 2006 on attaining the age of superannuation.

By order.

Sd/-
ARUNA KAPOOR,
Registrar General.

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

PERSONNEL(A-D) DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 13th January, 2006

No. 3-13/71-DP-Apptt.-Vol-III.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order that Smt. Sarita Prasad, IAS (HP: 69), shall retire from Government service on 31-8-2006 (A.N.) on attaining the age of superannuation.

Shimla-2, the 17th January, 2006

No. Per. (AP)AB(3)-16-2000.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order that Shri C. R. B. Lalit, IAS (HP: 94), shall retire from Government service on 31-12-2006 (A.N.) on attaining the age of superannuation.

Shimla-2, the 17th January, 2006

No. 3-28/72-DP-Apptt.-Vol-IV.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order that Shri Prem Singh Rana, IAS (HP: 70), shall retire from Government service on 30-6-2005 (A.N.) on attaining the age of superannuation.

By order.

Sd/-
Chief Secretary.

Shimla-2, the 20th January, 2006

No. 1-15/73-DP-Apptt. (2006).—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfers and postings of the following IAS officers, with immediate effect, in the public interest:—

1. Shri Rakesh Kaushal, IAS (HP: 91) presently Director of Land Records as Director of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj-cum-Ex-Officio Special Secretary (RD and PR) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.
2. Shri J. P. Singh, IAS (HP: 91) presently Director of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj-cum-Ex-Officio Special Secretary (RD & PR) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh as Secretary, Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, Shimla.

3. Shri B. R. Verma, IAS (HP: 96) Settlement Officer, Shimla Division, Shimla shall also hold the additional charge of the post of Director of Land Records, Himachal Pradesh Shimla till further orders.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to cancel the transfer of Shri Kashmir Chand, IAS, (H P: 90) Labour Commissioner-cum-Director of Employment, Himachal Pradesh Shimla as Secretary, Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, Shimla and orders of giving additional charge of Labour Commissioner-cum-Director of Employment, Himachal Pradesh Shimla to Shri R. D. Dhiman, IAS Registrar Co-operative Societies, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla ordered vide this department's Notification of even number dated 22-12-2005.

Shimla-2 the 30th January, 2006

No. 3-9-74-DP-Apptt.-III.—Consequent upon his appointment as Chairman of Himachal Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission, Shimla, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the retirement of Shri Yogesh Khanna, IAS (HP: 73) Additional Chief Secretary (Finance) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla, from Government service at his own request with effect from 30th January, 2006 (A.N.), also waiving of the requisite notice of three months' period for such retirement from service, in order to enable him to take up the appointment as Chairman in the said Electricity Regulatory Commission, in pursuance of Rule 16(2) of All India Services (DCRB) Rules, 1958 and the proviso of the aforesaid rule provided thereunder.

By order,

S. S. PARMAR,
Chief Secretary.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-171002, the 7th January, 2006

No. Agr. B(2) 8/2005.—On the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee and in consultation with Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the promotion of Shri Ashwani Kumar, Junior Engineer as Assistant Soil Conservation Officer (Engg.) (Class-II, Gazetted) in the pay scale of Rs. 7220—11660 on *ad hoc* basis with immediate effect.

2. These promotion will be subject to final decision of the Hon'ble Himachal Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal in OA No. 1771/2000 and Writ Petition (Civil) No. 61/2002 titled M. Nagaraj and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors. and Writ Petition (Civil) No. 295/2002—titled Devi Ram Tanwar and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors. in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

3. The promotee will have no claim for seniority, confirmation and further promotion etc.

4. The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to post Shri Ashwani Kumar, ASCO (Engg.) at Directorate of Agriculture against vacant post.

Shimla-171002, the 7th January, 2006

No. Agr. B-(2)-2/2005.—On the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee and in consultation with the H. P. Public Service Commission, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order

the promotion of the following Junior Engineers as Divisional Soil Conservation Officer (Class-I Gazetted) in pay scale Rs. 7220—11660 on *ad hoc* basis with immediate effect :—

1. Shri Updesh Singh
2. Shri Ramesh Kumar
3. Shri Pardeep Behal
4. Shri Daljeet Kumar Awasthi

2. These promotions will be subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Himachal Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal in O.A. No. 1771/2000 and writ Petition (Civil) No. 61/2002 titled M. Nagaraj and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors. and Writ Petition (Civil) No. 295/2002—titled Devi Ram Tanwar and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors. in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

3. The promotees will have no claim for seniority, confirmation and further promotion etc.

4. The posting orders of the above officers are being issued separately.

Shimla-171 002, the 19th January, 2006

No. Agr. B (2) 6 99-II.—In pursuance to Department of Personnel's instructions issued vide letter No. Per.(AP) C-F (1) 1/2002 dated 24-10-2002 and on the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the promotion of Shri Sunder Lal Yadav Superintendent Grade-II to the post of Superintendent Grade-I (Class-II, Gazetted) in the pay scale of Rs. 7720-220-8100-275-10300-340-11660 purely on *ad hoc* basis with immediate effect.

The above *ad hoc* promotion will not confer any right upon the Officer for regular promotion, continuation and seniority etc. against the post of Superintendent Grade-I. The promotion will however be subject to the final outcome in the Writ petition (Civil) No. 61/2002 titled M. Nagaraj and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors. and writ petition (Civil) No. 25/2002 titled Devi Ram Tanwar and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors. pending in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to order the posting of the above Officer on his promotion from the Office of DDA, Mandi to the office of Addl. Director of Agriculture, Dharamshala against a vacant post with immediate effect.

The above Officer is directed to join his new place of posting immediately and send joining report to this Department within 15 days positively failing which his promotion will be forfeited.

Shimla-171 002, the 30th January, 2006

No. AGR. B (2) 2 2005.—In continuation to this Department Notification of even No. dated 7-1-2006, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the posting and transfer of the following Sub-Divisional Soil Conservation Officers of Agriculture Department to the stations shown against their names with immediate effect in the public interest:—

Sl. No.	Name of officers	From	To
1	2	3	4
1.	S/Shri Updesh Singh, SDSCO.	Hamirpur	Una vice Shri Keshav Singh Chauhan SDSCO.

1	2	3	4
2.	Keshav Singh, Chauhan SDSCO.	Una	Bhatiyat (Chamba) as SMS against vacancy.
3.	Ramesh Kumar, SDSCO.	SAMETI Mashobra,	Paonta (Sirmaur vice Shri Susheel Kumar, SDSCO.
4.	Susheel Kumar, SDSCO.	Paonta	Shillai as SMS against vacancy.
5.	Pardeep Behal, SDSCO.	Mandi	Hamirpur as SDSCO against vacant post.
6.	Daljeet Kumar, Awasthi, SDSCO.	Palampur,	Mandias SDSCO vice Shri S. C. Soni.
7.	S. C. Soni, SDSCO.	Mandi	Mehla (Chamba) as SMS against vacant post.

Shimla-171 002, the 8th February, 2006

No. Agr. F (19)-8/99.—In order to accelerate the productivity level of Agriculture produce in the State, the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to constitute a Task Force consisting of the following:—

1. The Secretary (Agr.) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-171002. *Convener*
2. The Private Secretary (Horticulture) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh. *Member*
3. The Vice Chancellor, CSK HPKV, Palampur. *Member*
4. The Vice Chancellor, Dr. Y. S. Parmar University of Horticulture & Forestry Nauni, District Solan. *Member*
5. The Engineer-in-Chief (IPH), Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-1. *Member*
6. The Director of Himachal Pradesh State Seed and Organic Produce Certification Agency, Himachal Pradesh Shimla-5. *Member*
7. Director of Horticulture, Himachal Pradesh Shimla-171 002. *Member*
8. The Director of Agriculture, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-5. *Member-Secretary.*

Terms of Reference for Task Force :

1. To analyze the last crop-wise trends in productivity in the agriculture/horticulture sector in Himachal Pradesh, in terms of land holding groups and irrigation availability, quality of inputs used and marketing linkages.
2. To identify specifically the crops that require focused attention to enhance their productivity and the multipronged interventions required to facilitate enhancement in productivity in these specific crops.
3. To identify "best practice" in the State and examine the feasibility of repling these across the suitable agro-climates.
4. To review reports prepared at either All India or at State Government level and cull out specific recommendations made earlier to enhance productivity in the agriculture/horticulture sector

and also examine their relevance and applicability in Himachal Pradesh.

5. To consider the possibility of changing cropping patterns and shifting to more high value products (e. g. vanilla cultivation).

The Task Force shall meet quarterly or at such interval as the convener may direct.

The Task Force will submit its report by 31st July, 2006.

Shimla-2, the 9th February, 2006

No Agr.B(8)-6/2004—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer of Shri Rajesh Kumar Sood, ADO from SMF Badiarkhar to Soil Conservation Section Baijnath against vacancy, with immediate effect.

Shimla-2, the 9th February, 2006

No. Agr.B(15)-1 2003 -The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to repatriate Shri R. K. Soni, Assistant Agriculture Marketing Officer on secondment basis with the Policy Analysis & Planning Unit, H. P. Forest Sector Project to his parent Department i.e. Agriculture Department with immediate effect.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh on his repatriation is further pleased to post Shri R. K. Soni, Assistant Agriculture Marketing Officer in the Directorate of Agriculture.

The above officer is directed to report for duty at the new place of his posting immediately and send joining report to this Department.

Shimla-2, the 7th March 2006

No. Agr. B(5)-2/2003-1. The Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer of Shri Karam Chand Jaswal, SMS from Paonta Sahib, District Sirmour to Rohru, District Shimla as SMS against vacant post, with immediate effect in the public interest.

Shri Karam Chand Jaswal, SMS is directed to report for duty at his new place of posting and send the joining report to this Department.

By order,

Sd/-
Secretary.

सूचक निर्माण विभाग

अधिमृचनार्थ

यस: हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रशासन हेतु नामांकित भूमि अधिनियम 1964 के अन्तर्गत अधिमृचन किया जाता है कि उक्त परियोजना में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरान्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अधिनियम 1964 के अन्तर्गत अधिमृचन किया जाता है।

2. यह अधिमृचन ऐसे मन्त्री/अधिकारी का, जो इनमें सम्मिलित हो सकत है, की आकांक्षा के लिए अनुपलब्ध अधिमृचन, 1964 की धारा-4 के अन्तर्गत अधिमृचन किया जाता है।

3. उपरान्त धारा द्वारा प्रस्तावित भूमि का प्रयोग करने हेतु राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इन उपक्रम में कार्यरत मन्त्री/अधिकारी, उनके कार्यवाहियों और अधिकारों को धारा के अन्तर्गत भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सम्मिलन करने तथा इन धारा द्वारा अधिमृचन

अथवा अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सक्षम प्राधिकार देने है।

4. कोई भी हितवन्ध व्यक्ति, जिसे उक्त परियोजना में अधिमृचन के अन्तर्गत कोई आपत्ति हो, तो वह इस अधिमृचन के प्रकाशन होने के तिस (30) दिनों की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में अनुपलब्ध समाह्वान, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मन्त्री के कार्यालय में दायर कर सकता है।

*नाम रोहड़ी, संगरान, सायर, सहस्रीय सदर, जिला बिनामपुर में रानी-कोटला सड़क चौड़ा करने हेतु।

संख्या पी० बी० एच० पी० बी० ए० (7) 1-0/2006.

शिमला-2, 17 अप्रैल, 2006

विवरण		सहस्रीय : सदर	
जिला : बिनामपुर			
गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (बीघा बिघ्या)	
1	2	3	4
गोडी	195/191/155/1	0	1
	164/13/1	0	1
	149/16/1	0	6
	168/19/1	1	1
	21/1	0	17
	24/1	0	3
	31/1	0	6
	174/32/2	0	13
	33/1	0	12
	200/37/1	0	4
	179/40	0	3
	180/40	0	10
	182/41/1	0	17
	184/41/1	4	11
	187/43/2	0	9
किता .. 15		10	14
संगराना	38/1	0	2
	42/1	0	1
	123/43	0	2
	125/44/1	0	13
किता .. 4		0	18
सायर	588/522	1	1
	591/523	1	3
किता .. 2		2	4

*नाम रोहड़ा, मन्दावा गवाँ, करोट, सहस्रीय सदर, जिला बिनामपुर में रानी-कोटला सड़क चौड़ा करने हेतु।

संख्या पी० बी० एच० पी० बी० ए० (7) 1-0/2006.

शिमला-2, 18 अप्रैल, 2006

रोहड़ा	115/3/1	0	2
	119/114	1	1
	120/114/1	0	2
	122/4/1	0	11
	124/5/1	0	12
	126/7	0	12
	127/7	0	9
	128/7	1	3
	129/7	1	4
	131/9	0	6

1	2	3	4
	133/117/1	0	3
	135/11/1	1	3
	136/11/1	0	8
	138/41/1	0	18
	143/42/1	0	6
	144/42/2	1	8
	148/101/1	0	8
	148/101/2	0	1
	149/101/1	1	4
किला	19	12	1
मलवाड़	322/269/1	0	3
	324/269/1	0	7
	290/280/2	0	6
	290/280/3	1	10
	335/331	1	8
	318/73/1	1	5
	320/75/1	1	2

1	2	3	4
	333/74	0	15
किला	8	6	16
करोट	438/1	0	2
	451/1	0	1
	611/458/1	0	1
	613/457/1	0	1
	459/1	0	5
	460	0	2
	602/554	0	3
किला	7	0	15

प्रवेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
प्रधान मन्त्रि

भाग-2—वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा जघिस्तुनाएं इत्यादि

Office of the General Manager, District Industries
Centre Hamirpur (H. P.)

property described in the attached schedule is liable
for the satisfaction of the said debt.

DECLARATION UNDER SECTION 24 OF THE ACT

Hamirpur, the 3rd March, 2006

No. Udyog/HMR/DIC/M.M. Loan/1979/4227.—Whereas a notice was served to Shri Rattan Chand s/o Shri Sohan Singh, Vill. & P.O. Mundkhar, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur on 23-12-2005 under section 23 of H. P. State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 as modified and applied to Himachal Pradesh calling upon said Shri Rattan Chand s/o Shri Sohan Singh to pay to me the sum of Rs. 3200.00 as principal and Rs. 6967.00 as interest on or before the 31-1-2006 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I hereby declare that the sum of Rs. 3200.00 as principal and Rs. 6967.00 as interest total amount is Rs. 10167.00 due from said Shri Rattan Chand s/o Sh. Sohan Singh and that the property described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

SCHEDULE

All assets present and to be hereinafter acquired by the loanee, whether the said assets are present or in future in his name including books debts, stocks shares premises and machinery and purchased with the aid on loan or a part thereof and any other personal security of the loanee.

SURITIES

1. Shri Anant Ram s/o Shri Heera, Vill. & P.O. Mundkhar, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.).
2. Shri Harnam Singh s/o Shri Nathu Ram, Vill. & P.O. Mundkhar, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

Hamirpur, the 3rd March, 2006

No. Udyog/HMR/DIC/M.M. Loan/1992/4183.—Whereas a notice was served to Shri Kali Dass Sharma s/o Shri Bansi Lal Sharma Vill. & P.O. Jhau Kadan, Teh. Bhoranj (Hamirpur) on 23-12-2005 under section 23 of H. P. State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 as modified and applied to Himachal Pradesh calling upon said Shri Kali Dass Sharma s/o Shri Bansi Lal Sharma to pay to me the sum of Rs. 11500.00 as principal and Rs. 28210.00 as interest on or before the 31-1-2006 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I hereby declare that the sum of Rs. 11500.00 as principal and Rs. 28210.00 as interest total amount is 39710.00 due from the said Shri Kali Dass Sharma s/o Shri Bansi Lal Sharma and that the

SCHEDULE

All assets present and to be hereinafter acquired by the loanee, whether the said assets are present or in future in his name including book debts, stocks shares premises and machinery and purchased with the aid on loan or a part thereof and any other personal security of the loanee.

SURITIES

1. Shri Sant Ram s/o Shri Ajudiya Dass, Vill. palpar, P. O. Nagrota Gazian, Teh. Bhoranj ((Hamirpur).
2. Shri Bansi Lal s/o Shri Naudha Ram, Vill. and P. O. Chandruhi, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur.

Hamirpur, the 3rd March, 2006

No. Udyog/HMR/DIC/M.M. Loan/2044/4188. Whereas a notice was served to Shri Ravinder Kumar s/o Shri Jagdish Chand, Vill. Patta Blokhar, P. O. Patta, Teh. Bhoranj on the 27-7-2005 under section 23 of H. P. State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 as modified and applied to Himachal Pradesh calling upon the said Shri Ravinder Kumar s/o Shri Jagdish Chand to pay to me the sum of Rs. 3000.00 as principal and Rs. 8693.00 as interest on or before the 29-8-2005 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I hereby declare that the sum of Rs. 3000.00 (Three Thousand) as principal and Rs. Eight thousand six hundred ninety three as interest total amount of Rs. 11693.00 due from said Shri Ravinder Kumar s/o Shri Jagdish Chand and that the property described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

SCHEDULE

All assets present and to be hereinafter acquired by the loanee, whether the said assets are present or in future in his name including books debts, stocks shares premises and machinery and purchased with the aid on loan or a part thereof and any other personal security of the loanee.

SURITIES

1. Shri Baldev Singh s/o Shri Jai Singh, Vill. & P. O. Aghar, Teh. & Distt. Hamirpur.
2. Shri Ghasitu Ram s/o Shri Lachhman, Vill. Bhugot, P.O. Psaned, Teh. Bhoranj, Hamirpur.

Hamirpur, the 3rd March. 2006

SCHEDULE

No. Udyog./HMR/DIC/M.M.-Loan/1995/.—Where as a notice was served to Shri Parkash Chand s/o Shri Khiali Ram, Vill. Ghumarwin, P. O. Lagmanwin, Teh. Bhoranj (Hamirpur) on 23-12-2005 under section 23 of H. P. State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 as modified and applied to Himachal Pradesh calling upon the said Shri Parkash Chand s/o Shri Khiali Ram to pay to me the sum of Rs. 24900.00 as principal and Rs. 23125.00 as interest on or before the 31-1-2006 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I, hereby declare that the sum of Rs. 24900.00 as principal and Rs. 23125.00 as interest total amount is Rs. 48025.00 due from said Shri Parkash Chand s/o Shri Khiali Ram and that the property described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

All assets present and to be hereinafter acquired by the loanee, whether the said assets are present or in future in his name including book debts, stocks shares premises and machinery and purchased with the aid on loan or a part thereof and any other personal securities of the loanee.

SURITIES

1. Sh. Kanshi Ram s/o Sh. Jagat Ram, Vill. & P.O. Lambloo, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur.
2. Sh. Jundu Ram s/o Sh. Khannu Ram, Vill. Jhambar, P. O. Dera, Prol Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur.

Sd/-

General Manager,
District Industries Centre,
Hamirpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

Office of the District Collector, Kangra District at Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh

NOTIFICATION

Dharamshala, the 17th March, 2006

No. FDS-KGR/SKO-05/-2375 86.—Consequent upon the temporary suspension of the supplies of M/s Shaheed Kushal Singh & Brother, an authorised Kerosene Wholesale Dealer by the I.O.C. Ltd., and in partial modification of previous notification vide No. 5193-5210 dated 3-9-2005, issued in this behalf and also in exercise of the powers vested in me under sub-clause: d (i) of clause 2 of the Kerosene (Restriction on Use and Fixation of Ceiling Price) Order, 1993, I Bharat Khera, I.A.S., District Collector, Kangra District at Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh do hereby fix the maximum wholesale and retail sale declared price of Superior Kerosene Oil to be distributed under Public Distribution System as defined in Clause 2(j) of *ibid* Order, including all taxes, transportation and wholesale and retail sale commission. Mentioned against each Fair Price Shops/authorised kerosene retail out-lets, functioning in District Kangra, as under:—

Sl. No.	Name of FPS	No. of Consumer Cards	Quantity Allotted	Wholesale Rate	Retail Rate
1	2	3	4	5	6
M/s. Nand Lal & Co. Nagrota Bagwan : Basic Rate : 8209.00 Per Kl.					
1.	CAS, Sanghole	264	1540	Rs. P. 8813.00	Rs. P. 9.05
	CAS, Karanghat	308	1540		
	CAS, Jaisinghpur	450	3000		
	Shri Pertap Chand, D/H. Dallu	234	880		
	CAS, Haler	454	2000		
	CAS, Eastern Chadhiar	123	880		
	CAS, Dhaneri Harsi	588	2160		
			12,000		
2.	Shri Subhash, D/H. Tinbarh	142	880	8783.00	9.03
	CAS, Majehara	306	1760		
	CAS, Dagoh	298	1320		
	Shri Sansar Chand, Kathon	188	1120		
	CAS, Tumbur Jhamun	369	1760		
	CAS, Utarapur	121	880		
	CAS, Harot,				
	Through CSA, Karanghat	276	880		
	Sub Depot, Tikkari	147	880		
	CAS, Molag	143	980	8818.00	9.06
	CAS, Sari	139	880		
	Smt. Anuj, Kr. Upper Ther	96	660		
			12,000		
3.	HPSCSC, Sansai	409	2000	8813.00	9.05
	DH, Simbal	193	1100		
	DH, Kothi Sansai	279	1320		
	DH, Samletar	170	1000		
	HPSCSC, R/s Chadhiar	608	2000		
	CAS, Bahi	551	2000		
	Shri Krishan Kr. Chobu		440		
	TMS, R/s, Maranda	553	2140		
			12,000		

1	2	3	4	5	6
				Rs. P.	Rs. P.
4.	TMS. Daroh	906	3000	8813.00	9.05
	Shri Varinder, D/H. Daroh	83	440		
	Shri Satish, D/H. Daroh	44	220		
	Shri Kishori Lal, D/H. Sihotu	215	660		
	CAS, Mundi	351	660		
	CAS, Garh Khaz	292	660		
	Shri Saroop D/H. Garh Jamoola	232	880		
	CAS, Rora	243	1540		
	Shri Kishor Chand, Bari	275	420		
	CAS, Garh Talinoo	348	1760		
	CAS, Haldara	345	1760		
			12,000		
5.	Smt. Indu, D/H. Bachhwai	126	660	8813.00	9.05
	CAS, Gharana	274	1000		
	CAS, Bulota	267	880		
	CAS, Marhoon	430	880		
	CAS, Bharanta	264	1500		
	Shri Bakhshi, D/H. Thural	238	1760		
	Shri Bhoomi, D/H. Sanooh	197	1320		
	Shri Pritam, D/H. B. Ghatta	269	1540		
	HPSCSC, R/S, Thural	678	2460		
			12000		
6.	CAS, Charkhola	134	440	8696.00	8.94
	CAS, Darang	229	880		
	CAS, Mahadev	270	1760	8766.00	9.00
	CAS, Kharot	514	2030		
	CAS, Tanda Balha	210	1380		
	CAS, Panaper Kholi	299	1320		
	CAS, Bhadrol	158	1100		
	Sub Depot, Dai	139	880		
	CAS, Naura	369	2240		
			12,000		
M/s Kaundal Kerosene Agency :					
Basic Rate : Rs. 8249.00 Per Kl.					
1.	CAS, Arla	457	2000	8633.00	8.90
	CAS, Saloh	430	2000		
	CAS, Garla Dai	312	1380		
	CAS, Bhaddel Devi	372	1540		
	CAS, Hainja	135	440		
	Shri Ramesh, D/H. Badain	283	440		
	Shri Balbir, D/H Boda	227	660		
	Shri Ashwani, D/H, Garla Dai	62	220		
	CAS, Sulaha	498	2000		
	CAS, Dehan	158	660		
	Co-op. Consumer Store, Bari	249	660		
			12,000		
2.	CAS, Bhattu Samula	327	1000	8753.00	9.00
	Smt. Simro Devi, D/H, Sallan	268	1000		
	M/s RCNK, Jassun	225	1000		
	CAS, Kakrain	236	1000		
	Shri Rakesh, D/H. Pantehar	92	440		
	CAS, Nanawan	288	880		
	CAS, Kural	204	440		
	Shri Gian Chand, D/H. Kural	152	440		
	CAS, Jassun Samula	260	1000		
	CAS, Parore	381	1000		
	CAS, Gaggal	249	880		
	Shri Goverdhan, D/H. Bhawarna	269	920		
	CAS, Upper Bhawarna	689	2000		
			12,000		
M/s Dayaloo Mull Gian Chand, Kangra :					
Basic Rate : Rs. 8194.00 Per Kl.					
1.	CAS, Rit	391	2000	8853.00	9.10
	M/s RK Bros. Kotlu	217	880		
	CAS, Lahari	218	1540		
	Shri Madan Lal, D/H, Talwar	125	220		
	Shri Dharam S, D/H, J. Devi	368	2000		
	CAS, Tikkari Ghumarnu	409	2000		

1	2	3	4	5	6
				Rs. P.	Rs. P.
	Shri Arjun Dass, D/H, Kutahan	199	1000		
	CAS, Lahat	230	1100		
	CAS, Har	396	1260		
			12,000		
2.	CAS, Alampur	312	2000	8798.00	9.05
	Shri Saruti, D/H, Alampur	164	860		
	Sub Depot, Kagain	99	220		
	Shri Nirmal Kumar	161	1320		
	Shri Kuldeep Kr. Andrana	102	660		
	CAS, Gandder	499	1320		
	CAS, Chhanchhari	506	1760		
	CAS, Punner	307	880		
	M/s Vikas Store, D/H, Khaira	345	1120		
	CAS, Upper Khaira	502	1860		
			12,000		
3.	Shri Karam Singh, D/H, Malag	78	440	8759.00	9.00
	CAS, Khural	239	880		
	CAS, Bhoda	129	880		
	CAS, Sai Gadiara	92	440		
	CAS, Garh Kodara	292	880		
	Shri Onker, D/H, Bhawarna	340	1320		
	CAS, Bari Baryam		440		
	CAS, Bandahu	232	1100		
	CAS, Paplaha	100	520		
	Shri Arvind, DH, Balakrupi	536	2100		
	CAS, Dhar Chharotarian	512	3000		
			12,000		
4.	CAS, Matehar	275	1320	8759.00	9.00
	CAS, Dheera	334	880		
	Shri Harnam, D/H, Panyali	156	1100		
	Shri Chanda Singh, D/H, Chowki	224	1100		
	CAS, Kahanpatt	242	880		
	CAS, Rajhoon Pira	183	1100		
	Sub Depot, Chambi Rajhoon	215	660		
	CAS, Cadiara, Rajhoon	329	1540	8689.00	8.93
	CAS, Behal	316	980		
	CAS, Toru	125	440	8759.00	9.00
	CAS, Purba	420	2000		
			12,000		
5.	Shri Sadhu Ram, Dadh	691	3000	8853.00	9.10
	CAS, Kosari	276	1620		
	Shri Dharam Singh, D/H, Delru	167	660		
	Sub Depot, Ropari	161	1100		
	Shri Des Raj, D/H, Suar	82	440		
	Sub Depot, Suan	95	660		
	CAS, Daraman	241	1540		
	CAS, Tatrora	305	1760		
			12,000		
6.	HPSCSC, R/S, Thural	678	2000	8798.00	9.05
	Shri Arvind, D/H, Balakrupi	536	3000		
	CAS, Kuhan	396	2640		
	CAS, Duhak	185	1100		
	Shri Devi Singh, D/H, Kona	216	1760		
	CAS, Kiarwan	208	1200		
			12,000		

TERMS & CONDITIONS:

- Every wholesale and Retail Sale Dealer will adhere to the provisions of H.P. Specified Articles (Regulation of supplies & Distribution) Order, 2003 and the terms & conditions of the authorisation issued thereunder by the District Controller, Food Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs, Kangra at Dharamshala and also the provisions of Kerosene Oil (Restriction on use & Fixation of Ceiling Price) Order, 1993 as well as of the H.P. Hoarding & Profiteering Prevention Order, 1977.
- Every wholesale Dealer of Kerosene Oil (SKO) and the Designated Inspectors/Circle Inspectors of Department of Food, Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs, Kangra at Dharamshala will adhere to the

Delivered System of Kerosene Oil, issued by the Director, FCS & CA, H.P. vide letter No. FDS. H. (F) (4) 1/93-II-15944-55, dated 24-5-1996.

3. No wholesale dealer will deviate the quantity of kerosene oil fixed under this Notification and mentioned each Fair Price Shop/Authorised Retail Outlet except with the written instruction to be issued by the DC, FCS & CA, Kangra at Dharamshala and in accordance with the directions of the Director, FCS & CA, H.P. vide his letter No. FDS, H(F)(4) 20/94-II-26960-71, dated 11-12-2003. However District Controller, FCS & CA, Kangra at Dharamshala is empowered to increase/decrease the quota of kerosene oil of any Fair Price Shop/Authorised Kerosene Retailer or to issue additional quantity of kerosene to any Fair Price Shop Holder keeping in view the number of ration cards attached with that FPS and the entitlement of monthly quota as per quantum fixed by the Director, FCS & CA, H.P.
4. The District Controller, Food, Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs, Kangra at Dharamshala will fix the monthly quota of newly opened Fair Price Shops and shall also revise the quota of existing Fair Price Shops, keeping in view the addition and deletion of ration card/PDS Permits and the prescribed scale of distribution to the consumers. However the whole sale and retail sale rates will be applicable for newly opened Fair Price Shops as per these rates, fixed above, for the adjoining Fair Price Shop.
5. The retail sale dealer will issue kerosene only to the consumers on ration cards/authorised documents, issued by the competent authority, and on the scale/quantum, as fixed by the Director, FCS & CA, H.P., Shimla from time to time.
6. Every Wholesale Dealer shall intimate increase or decrease in the oil company Depot rates (Basic Rate) at once to the office of the District Controller, FCS & CS, Kangra at Dharamshala and shall increase or decrease his wholesale rate, applicable to the authorised Fair Price Shops Holders, as the case may be, equal to the increase or decrease in the oil Company Depot Rate (Basic rate) with out awaiting for new notification.
7. No SKO Wholesaler shall unless or otherwise directed by the District Controller, FCS & CA, Kangra at Dharamshala shall refuse to distribute or supply SKO to any authorised retailer on any working day after sun rise and before sun set. However No Kerosene Wholesale Dealer or the authorised retailers shall deliver/distribute/sell Kerosene Oil before sun rise and after sun set.
8. Every SKO wholesale Dealer shall take all reasonable steps to lift total monthly allotment of SKO up to 25th of every month and shall also ensure that sufficient stocks of SKO are available his place storage at all times. Any deviation will amount to non compliance of directions and shall attract the provisions of H.P. Specified Articles (Regulation of Distribution) Order, 2003.
9. No consumer shall have in his possession at any one time the quantity of SKO exceeding the maximum monthly fixed quantum, quoted here under and drawn against Consumer Card.
 - (i) Consumer having DBC = Nil.
 - (ii) Consumer having SBC = 3 Liters in a month.
 - (iii) Consumer having no LPG connection = 20 Liters in a month.
10. No authorised retailer/Fair Price Shop Holder shall sell or offer for sale to any Consumer Card Holder in one transaction a quantity of SKO exceeding the maximum monthly quantum as fixed by the Government or the Director, FCS & CA, H.P. from time to time.

This Notification will come into force with immediate effect and shall remain operative during suspension period of the authorisation of M/s Shaheed Kushal Singh & Brothers; Kerosene Wholesale Dealer, Dharamshala.

BHARAT KHERA,
District Collector,
District Kangra at Dharamshala,
District Magistrate, Kangra.

कार्यालय सहायक पञ्जीयक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

कार्यालय आदेश

शिमला, 28 मार्च, 2006

मं०-1002.—यह कि निरीक्षक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला (शहरी) ने इस कार्यालय को सूचित किया है कि दि प्रमोना महिला हस्तशिल्प एवं हथकरघा सहकारी सभा सी०, बूटल बिल्डिंग लोअर बाजार, शिमला-1 में यह कई वर्षों से न तो कोई कार्य कर रही है और न ही सभा की प्रबन्ध कमेटी का कोई वर्षों से नियमानुसार चुनाव द्वारा गठन किया गया है। सभा बिल्कुल निष्क्रिय हो चुकी है तथा उन उद्देश्य की पूर्ति नहीं हो रही है जिसके लिए सभा का गठन किया गया था। सभा केवल नाम मात्र कागजों तक ही सीमित हो कर रह गई है।

यह कि पञ्जीयक सहकारी सभाएं हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला-9 के आदेश संख्या 10-124/90-रूप० (ए० एण्ड एस०) दिनांक 13-11-1997 के द्वारा ऐसी समस्त सहकारी सभा को विघटन

में डालने के निर्देश दिए गए हैं जो सहकारी सभाएं निष्क्रिय एवं प्रसूत हो चुकी हैं। स्पष्ट है कि उपरोक्त सहकारी सभा का कार्य नियमानुसार संचार रूप में नहीं चल रहा है तथा जिन उद्देश्य की पूर्ति के लिए इसका गठन/पञ्जीयन किया गया था उसमें सभा पूर्ण रूप से असफल पाई गई है। अतः उक्त सभा को विघटन में डालना ही उचित प्रतीत होता है।

अतः उपरोक्त नव्यों एवं परिस्थितियों के दृष्टिकोण में, बो० एन० जर्मा, सहायक पञ्जीयक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला, जिला शिमला हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभाएं अधिनियम, 1963 (ऐक्ट नं० 3 प्रा० 1969) की धारा 78(1) सीमित द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए दि प्रमोना महिला हस्तशिल्प एवं हथकरघा सहकारी सभा सीमित को विघटन में डालने के आदेश देता हूँ तथा उक्त अधिनियम को धारा 79 तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभाएं नियम, 1971 के नियम, 106 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निरीक्षक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला शहरी को दि प्रमोना महिला हस्तशिल्प एवं हथकरघा सहकारी सभा का विघटन निष्पन्न करता हूँ। विघटन आदेश जारी होने की तिथि से एक वर्ष के भीतर-भीतर समापन कार्यवाही पूर्ण करके अन्तिम प्रानवर्दन आ कार्यालय को प्रस्तुत करें।

शिमला-9, 28 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 1009.—यह कि निरीक्षक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला शहरी ने इस कार्यालय को सूचित किया है कि दि कर्मल बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा सीमित दि भाल शिमला ने गत कई वर्षों से न तो कोई कार्य कर रही है और न ही सभा की प्रबन्ध कमेटी का गत कई वर्षों से नियमानुसार चुनाव द्वारा गठन किया गया है। सभा बिल्कुल निष्क्रिय हो चुकी है तथा उन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति नहीं हो रही है जिसके लिए सभा का गठन किया गया था। सभा केवल नाम मात्र कागजों तक ही सीमित हो कर रह गई है।

यह कि पंजीयक सहकारी सभाएं, हिमाचल प्रदेश शिमला के प्रादेश संख्या 10-124/90-कूप0 (ए0 एण्ड एल0) दिनांक 13-11-1997 द्वारा ऐसी समस्त सहकारी सभा को विघटन में डालने के निर्देश दिए गए हैं जो सहकारी सभाएं निष्क्रिय एवं प्रसृत हो चुकी हैं। स्पष्ट है कि उपरोक्त सहकारी सभा का कार्य नियमानुसार मुचाह रूप से नहीं चल रहा है तथा जिन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिए इसका गठन/पंजीयन किया था उसमें सभा पूर्ण रूप से असफल पाई गई है। अतः उक्त सभा को विघटन में डालना ही उचित प्रतीत होता है।

अतः उपरोक्त तथ्यों के दृष्टिगत मैं, बी0 एन0 शर्मा, सहायक पंजीयक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश, सहकारी सभाएं अधिनियम 1968 (एक्ट नं 3 आक्ट 1969) की धारा 78(1) सीमित द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए दि कर्मल बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा सीमित को विघटन में डालने के प्रादेश देता हूँ तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 79 तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभाएं नियम, 1971 के नियम 106 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निरीक्षक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला शहरी को दी कर्मल बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा का विघटक नियुक्त करता हूँ। विघटन प्रादेश जारी होने की तिथि से एक वर्ष के भीतर-भीतर समापन कार्यवाही पूर्ण करके अन्तिम प्रतिवेदन इस कार्यालय को प्रस्तुत करें।

शिमला-9, 28 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 1016.—यह कि निरीक्षक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला शहरी ने इस कार्यालय को सूचित किया है कि दि कर्मल बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा सीमित दि भाल शिमला ने गत कई वर्षों से न तो कोई कार्य कर रही है और न ही सभा की प्रबन्ध कमेटी का गत कई वर्षों से नियमानुसार चुनाव द्वारा गठन किया गया है। सभा बिल्कुल निष्क्रिय हो चुकी है तथा उन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति नहीं हो रही है जिसके लिए सभा का गठन किया गया था। सभा केवल नाममात्र कागजों तक ही सीमित हो कर रह गई है।

यह कि पंजीयक सहकारी सभाएं, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला-9 के प्रादेश संख्या 10-124/90-कूप0 (ए0 एण्ड एल0) दिनांक 13-11-1997 द्वारा ऐसी समस्त सहकारी सभा को विघटन में डालने के निर्देश दिए गए हैं जो सहकारी सभाएं निष्क्रिय एवं प्रसृत हो चुकी हैं। स्पष्ट है कि उपरोक्त सहकारी सभा का कार्य नियमानुसार मुचाह रूप से नहीं चल रहा है तथा जिन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिए इसका गठन/पंजीयन किया गया था उसमें सभा पूर्ण रूप से असफल पाई गई है। अतः उक्त सभा को विघटन में डालना ही उचित प्रतीत होता है।

अतः उपरोक्त तथ्यों एवं परिस्थितियों के दृष्टिगत मैं, बी0 एन0 शर्मा, सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाएं शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभाएं अधिनियम, 1968 (एक्ट, नं 3 आक्ट 1969) की धारा 78(1) सीमित द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए दि कर्मल बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा सीमित, सहकारी सभा सीमित को विघटन में डालने के प्रादेश देता हूँ तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 79 तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभाएं नियम 1971 के नियम 106 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निरीक्षक सहकारी सभाएं शिमला शहरी को दी कर्मल बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा का विघटक नियुक्त करता हूँ। विघटन प्रादेश जारी होने

की तिथि से एक वर्ष के भीतर-भीतर समापन कार्यवाही पूर्ण करके अन्तिम प्रतिवेदन इस कार्यालय को प्रस्तुत करें।

शिमला-9, 28 मार्च, 2006

संख्या-1022.—यह कि निरीक्षक सहकारी सभाएं, शिमला ने इस कार्यालय को सूचित किया है कि दि शिवालिक बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा सी0 गंज बाजार, शिमला गत कई वर्षों से न तो कोई कार्य कर रही है और न ही सभा की प्रबन्ध कमेटी का गत कई वर्षों से नियमानुसार चुनाव द्वारा गठन किया गया है। सभा बिल्कुल निष्क्रिय हो चुकी है तथा उन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति नहीं हो रही है जिसके लिए सभा का गठन किया गया था सभा केवल नाम-मात्र कागजों तक ही सीमित होकर रह गई है।

यह कि पंजीयक सहकारी सभाएं, हि0 प्र0 शिमला-1 के प्रादेश संख्या 10-124/90-कूप0 (ए0 एण्ड एल0), दिनांक 13-11-1997 के द्वारा ऐसी समस्त सहकारी सभा को विघटन में डालने के निर्देश दिये गये हैं जो सहकारी सभाएं निष्क्रिय एवं प्रसृत हो चुकी हैं। स्पष्ट है कि उपरोक्त सहकारी सभा का कार्य नियमानुसार मुचाह रूप से नहीं चल रहा है तथा जिन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिए इसका गठन किया गया था उनमें सभा पूर्ण रूप से असफल पाई गई है। अतः उक्त सभा को विघटन में डालना ही उचित प्रतीत होता है।

अतः उपरोक्त तथ्यों एवं परिस्थितियों के दृष्टिगत मैं, बी0 एन0 शर्मा, सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाएं, शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभा अधिनियम, 1968, एक्ट नं 3, आक्ट 1969 की धारा 78(1) सीमित द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए दि शिवालिक बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा सीमित को विघटन में डालने के प्रादेश देता हूँ तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 79 तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभाएं नियम, 1971 के नियम 106 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निरीक्षक, सहकारी सभाएं, शिमला (शहरी) को दी शिवालिक बेरोजगार यातायात सहकारी सभा का विघटक नियुक्त करता हूँ। विघटन प्रादेश जारी होने की तिथि से एक वर्ष के भीतर-भीतर समापन कार्यवाही पूर्ण करके अन्तिम प्रतिवेदन इस कार्यालय को प्रस्तुत करें।

बी0 एन0 शर्मा,
सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाएं,
शिमला, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)।

कार्यालय सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाएं, ऊना, जिला ऊना,
हिमाचल प्रदेश

कार्यालय प्रादेश

ऊना, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या ए0 आर0 (कूप) निरीक्षक मुख्यालय/3741-44.—जैसा कि दी ऊना जिला सहकारी कर्मचारी सहकारी हाऊस विल्डिंग सभा सीमित ऊना, दिनांक 7-8-1985 को पंजीयन संख्या 410 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत हुई थी और सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाओं के कार्यालय प्रादेश संख्या 5473-76, दिनांक 24-2-2003 के द्वारा विघटन में डाली गई थी;

हालांकि विघटक द्वारा अपने विघटनाधीन कार्यालय के दौरान सभा को पुर्नजीविन करने के प्रयास किये गये, परन्तु वांछित परिणाम प्राप्त नहीं हुआ। सभा का दायित्व व प्राप्तिय सभा के अन्तिम तारीख अंकगण पत्र व निरीक्षण-पत्र के अनुसार समायोजित हो चुकी है;

जैसा कि उक्त सभा के विघटक द्वारा अन्तिम प्रतिवेदन एवं निरीक्षक, सहकारी सभाओं, ऊना ने अपने कार्यालय पत्रांक 323,

दिनांक 31-3-2006 के अन्तर्गत उक्त सभा के पंजीकरण को रद्द करने की सिफारिश भी की थी।

अतः उपरोक्त के दृष्टिगत मैं, दिने राम धीमान, सहायक पंजीयक, सहायक सभायें, ऊना जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश, सहकारी सभायें अधिनियम, 1968 (एक्ट नं० 3 अंक 1969) की धारा 83(2) के अन्तर्गत पंजीयक, सहकारी सभायें, हिमाचल प्रदेश जिला की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये आज दिनांक 31-3-2006 का उपर्युक्त सहकारी सभा के पंजीयन का रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

ऊना, 31 मार्च, 2006

सं० ए० आर० (कृप) निरीक्षक मुख्यालय/2737-40 --जैसा कि श्री नंगल जयियाल सहकारी परिवहन सभा समित, दिनांक 9-12-1986 को पंजीयन संख्या 420 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत हुई थी और सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभायें के कार्यालय आदेश संख्या 5557-60, दिनांक 24-2-2003 के द्वारा विघटन में डाली गई थी।

हालांकि विघटन द्वारा आने विघटनाधीन कार्यालय के दौरान सभा को पुनर्जीवित करने के प्रयास किये गये परन्तु वांछित परिणाम प्राप्त नहीं हुआ। सभा का दायित्व व प्राप्ताध्य सभा के अन्तिम तारीख अकेक्षण-पत्र व निराक्षण-पत्र के अनुसार समाप्तमान हो चुकी है।

जैसा कि उक्त सभा के विघटन द्वारा अन्तिम प्रतिवेदन व निरीक्षक, सहकारी सभायें गगरेट ने आने कार्यालय पत्रांक 314, दिनांक 27-3-2006 के अन्तर्गत उक्त सभा के पंजीकरण का रद्द करने की सिफारिश भी की है।

अतः उपरोक्त के दृष्टिगत मैं, दिने राम धीमान, सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभायें, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभायें अधिनियम, 1968 (एक्ट नं० 3 अंक 1969) की धारा 83 (2) के अन्तर्गत पंजीयक, सहकारी सभायें, हिमाचल प्रदेश, जिला की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए आज दिनांक 31-3-2006 को उपर्युक्त सहकारी सभा के पंजीयन का रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

दिने राम धीमान,
सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभायें,
ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

भाग-3--अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर सभाओं के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनैशियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि
HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-1, the 17th April, 2006

No. HHC/Rules/14 61/90-7781.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh in exercise of the powers conferred under Article 229 of the constitution of India and all other enabling powers in this behalf, is pleased to make the following amendments in "The Himachal Pradesh High Court Officers and the Members of the Staff (Recruitment, Conditions of Service, Conduct and Appeal), Rules, 2003".

1. *Short title.*—These Rules shall be called "The Himachal Pradesh High Court Officers and the Members of Staff (Recruitment, Conditions of Service, Conduct and Appeal) (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 2006".

2. *Commencement.*—They shall come into force with immediate effect.

3. *Amendment.*—Item Nos. 1, 7, 8 and 12 below class-III Part-D, of the Schedule annexed to "The Himachal Pradesh High Court Officers and the Members of Staff (Recruitment, Condition of Service, Conduct and Appeal) Rules, 2003". shall be substituted as under:—

SCHEDULE 'D'

Class-III

Sl. No.	Name of the Post	No. of Post	Mode of appointment	Qualification	Experience	Scale of pay
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Senior Assistants/Record Keeper/Reader to Registrar General/Court Officer/Auditor.	32	(i) 90% by promotion from amongst Clerks, which term includes Junior Assistant/Proof Readers.	—	Six years	Rs. 5800-200-7000-220-8100-275-9200 + S.A. Rs. 240/-
			(ii) 10% by selection on the basis of limited competitive examination from amongst Clerks, which term includes Junior Assistants of the Subordinate Courts.	Graduation	five years	
7.	Clerks/Proof Readers.	70	(a) 80 % by direct recruitment	Graduation		Rs. 3120-100-3200-120-4260-140 4400-150 5000-160-5160
			(b) 20 % by transfer from amongst the Restorers/Book Binder failing which by selection on the basis of limited competitive examination from amongst Class IV servants of the High Court.	Matriculation 2nd Division or Plus Two.	Five years	4-(with initial start of Rs. 3220-)- S.A Rs 120.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		(c) Further failing which by selection on the basis of limited competitive examination from amongst Class IV employees of the Sub-ordinate Courts Explanation: Candidates appointed by any of the aforesaid modes shall have to pass the typing test with a minimum speed of 30 words per minute, within the period of probation, which term includes extended probation period, if any.		Matriculation 2nd Division or Plus Two	Five years	4.
8. Restorers	10	By promotion from amongst Class IV servants failing which by direct recruitment.		Matriculation in case of Class IV Court servants. Graduation in case of direct recruitment.	Rs. 3120-100-3200-120-4260-140-4400-150-5000-160-5160-S. A. Rs. 120.	
12. Book Binder	1	By promotion from amongst the Class IV Court servants, failing which by direct recruitment.		Matriculate in case of appointment from amongst Court servants with knowledge of book binding Graduation and diploma in book binding in case of direct recruitment.	Rs. 3120-100-3200-120-4260-140-4400-150-5000-160-5160-S. A. Rs. 120.	

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

Sd/-
Registrar (Rules)

Shimla-1. the 20th April, 2006

No. HHC Rules/Vol. V/97-8360.—In exercise of the powers vested in it under Section 23 of the State of Himachal Pradesh Act, 1970, Section 129 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 as amended from time to time, Article 225 of the Constitution of India and all other powers enabling hereunto, the High Court of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make the following amendments in the High Court of Himachal Pradesh (Original Side) Rules, 1997:—

1. These Rules shall be called the High Court of Himachal Pradesh (Original Side) (Fifth Amendment) Rules, 2006.

2. These Rules shall come into force with immediate effect.

3. Sub-rule (33) of Rule 3 of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh (Original Side) Rules, 1997 is substituted as under:—

“(33) Such cases where the Court itself, in the first instance, has fixed a time limit for filing reply/objections/rejoinders or other pleadings or for compliance of other directions in furtherance of the progress of a case and if despite such time initially granted by the Court the party concerned has not done the needful, on expiry of the period so granted by the Court in the first instance, the matter shall not be listed before the Court. Such matters shall be listed before the Deputy Registrar/Additional Registrar to be nominated specially for

this purpose by the Chief Justice and thereafter, before the Registrar, to be so nominated by the Chief Justice, for extension of time, beyond the time limit fixed by the Court, as per procedure laid down in sub-rules (xvii), (xviii) and (xix) of Rule 1 of the Himachal Pradesh High Court (Appellate Side) Rules, 1997. This procedure shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to all such matters:

Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rules (33) of Rule 3, actual date matters and matters containing peremptory directions shall be listed only before the Courts.”

BY ORDER OF THE HIGH COURT.

Sd/-
Registrar (Rules).

धर्म विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 11-3/93 (नंबर) आई 0 80/06-कलक. — प्रवाहस्तोत्रो
का यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Jee Lal s/o Shri Swarnu
Ram, Village Sadoh, P. O. Baryara, Sub Tehsil
Kotli, District Mandi (H. P.) Vs. The Executive
Engineer Chenab Valley H.P.P.W.D. Division
Udaipur, District Lahaul & Spiti (H. P.)
के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है।

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 मितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Jeet Lal s/o Shri Swarnu Ram workman by the Executive Engineer, Chenab Valley H.P.P.W.D. Division, Udaipur, District Lahaul & Spiti (H. P.) w. e. f. 1-11-2000 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 11-1/8 (लैब) आई० डी०/०६-मुन्दरनगर.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Smt. Kala Devi d/o Shri Mansa Ram, Village Nalaw, P. O. Jassal, Tehsil Karsog, District Mandi (H. P.) Vs. The Divisional Forest Officer, Forest Division, Karsog, District Mandi (H. P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 मितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of services of Smt. Kala Devi d/o Shri Mansa Ram workman by the Divisional Forest Officer, Forest Division, Karsog, District Mandi, (H. P.) w. e. f. 11-12-2002 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 11-1/86 (लैब०) आई० डी०/०६-पावटा.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Hukam Singh s/o Shri Atma Ram, V. P. O. Kollar Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H. P.) Vs 1. The Divisional Forest Officer, Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, 2. The Divisional Forest Officer, Nahan Division, Nahan, District Sirmaur (H. P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त

अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा-5 के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 मितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Hukam Singh s/o Shri Atma Ram, workman by the (1) The Divisional Forest Officer, Paonta Division, Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H.P.), (2) The Divisional Forest Officer, Nahan Division, District Sirmaur, (H. P.) w. e. f. 1-11-2000 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 11-2/93 (लैब) आई० डी०/०६-सोलन.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Jag Mohan Dhiman s/o Shri Ram Partap, Village Fatehpur, P. O. Bhurwala, Tehsil Naraingarh, District Ambala, Haryana Vs. M's Micro Turner-II, Village Jharmajri, P. O. Barotiwala, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan (H. P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा 5 के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 मितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा(1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Jag Mohan Dhiman s/o Shri Ram Partap workman by the M's Micro Turner-II, Village Jharmajri, P. O. Barotiwala, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan (H. P.) w. e. f. 7-1-2004 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 11-1/7 (लैब) आई० डी०/०५-जोगिन्दर नगर.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Ram Chander s/o Shri Piundi Ram, Village Ghoran, P. O. & Tehsil Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H. P.) Vs-Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Electrical Division, Mandi (H. P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त

अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा 5 के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/ औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिए भेजे जाने योग्य है।

प्रतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-अम (नूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/ औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Chander s/o Shri Puri Ram workman by the Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Electrical Division Hospital Road Mandi, District Mandi (H.P.) w. e. f. 1-4-2001 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as alleged by the workman is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?”

जिमला-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 11-2/86 (लैब) आई0 डी0/05-बिलासपुर.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Ram Paul s/o Shri Beli Ram, V.P.O. Makri, Tehsil Naina Deviji, District Bilaspur (H.P.) Vs. The Additional Superintending, H.P.S.E.B. Electrical Division, Bilaspur (H.P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/ औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिए भेजे जाने योग्य है।

प्रतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-अम (नूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के

अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/ औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Paul s/o Shri Beli Ram workman by the Additional Superintending Engineer, Electrical Division, H. P. S.E.B. Division, Bilaspur (H. P.) w. e. f. 26-4-1999 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?”

श्रम एवं रोजगार विभाग

अधिसूचना

जिमला-1, 18 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या 11-2/93(लैब) आई0 डी0/2004-सोलन. इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या दिनांक 5-4-2005 तथा शुद्धि-पत्र दिनांक 7-4-2005 के अनुक्रम में मैसर्स जय माता गिलास लि0, ढ़िपरा, बरोटीवाला, जिला सोलन तथा जय माता वर्करज यूनिन (इंटर) पंजी0 संख्या 495, बरोटीवाला, जिला सोलन के मध्य हुए औद्योगिक विवाद में निम्नलिखित अतिरिक्त संदर्भ से जोड़ा जाए :—

“क्या समझौता जापन दिनांक 6-1-2005 (प्रति संलग्न) के शर्त नं0-2, दिनांक 9-10-2004 से 6-1-2005 तक समय अवधि कामगारों द्वारा हड़ताल की गई थी या कारखाना प्रबंधन द्वारा कारखाना में ताला बन्दी की गई थी? यदि कामगार हड़ताल पर थे, तो क्या यह हड़ताल गैर कानूनी थी? यदि नहीं, तो कामगार किस वेतन व अन्य सेवा लाभों के पात्र व हकदार है? यदि उपरोक्त अवधि में कामगार हड़ताल पर नहीं थे बल्कि कारखाना प्रबंधकों द्वारा ताला बन्दी की गई थी? यदि ताला बन्दी गैर कानूनी थी, तो कामगार उक्त समय अवधि के लिए किस वेतन व लाभों के हकदार होंगे?”

हस्ताक्षरित/-
श्रमायुक्त।

भाग-4-स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाईड और टाऊन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग

-शून्य-

भाग 5-व्यक्तिगत अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

ब अदालत श्री के0 आर0 शर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री गिरधारी लाल मुन्नी श्री मौजी राम, गांव पट्टा, परगना लून, तहसील घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

श्राम जनता।

विषय.—आयना-17 अधीन धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969

नोटिस बनाम श्राम जनता।

श्री गिरधारी लाल पुत्र श्री मौजी राम, गांव पट्टा, परगना लून, तहसील घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र दिया है कि उसके लड़के अमय कुमार का जन्म दिनांक 18-8-1999 को हुआ है। जो नगर पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज किया जावे।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित सम्पन्धियों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को अमय कुमार की

जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 4-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असासतन या बकालतन अपनी आपत्ति/एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा मुताबिक शपथ-पत्र जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत किए जाने बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

वाज दिनांक 16-2-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

के0 आर0 शर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री मुनमी राम, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी पूर्व नायब तहसीलदार, सदर, जिला बिलासपुर (हि0 प्र0)

इन्तकाल नम्बर 105 मकफूल उलखबरी, मौजा बीगर, तहसील सदर, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश, बावत बरास्त शंकर पुत्र गुमाऊ, निवासी गांव बीगर, तहसील सदर, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

नोटिस

बनाम

श्राम जनता।

श्री नवलू उपनाम खन्ना पुत्र शंकर, निवासी गांव डोगर, तहसील सदर, जिला बिलासपुर ने एक प्रार्थना-पत्र बरा ए दर्ज व तस्दीक करने इन्तकाल मकफद-उल-खबरी अपने पिता श्री शंकर का दिया है जिसका इन्तकाल शंकर के जायज वारसान के नाम दर्ज कर दिया है। श्री शंकर अरसा 30 वर्ष से लापता है तथा उसके बारे में कोई जानकारी किसी को न है। इसमें प्रतीत होता है कि शंकर फौत हो चुका है।

फिर भी इस नोटिस द्वारा ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि शंकर की सम्पत्ति का इन्दाज इसके जायज वारसान के नाम दर्ज व तस्दीक करने में किसी को कोई श्राप्ति हो तो वह अपनी श्राप्ति अन्दर तीस दिन इस अदालत में निवेदन दायर करें अन्यथा इन्तकाल मन्जूर कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 7-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

मुन्शी राम,
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील सदर, जिला बिलासपुर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

न्यायालय उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी चुराह, जिला चम्बा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री चन्दू राम सुपुत्र श्री जैफरी राम, निवासी ग्राम भदोई, तहसील सलूणी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री चन्दू राम पुत्र श्री जैफरी, निवासी ग्राम भदोई, तहसील सलूणी, जिला चम्बा ने आवेदन किया कि मैंने अपनी शादी श्रीमती रणजीता विधवा श्री बलकार सिंह, रेलवे रोड, जगाधरी, जिला यमुनानगर के साथ दिनांक 10-8-2005 को रस्मो रिवाज इलाका व कोम कर ली है और श्रीमती रणजीता मेरे घर ग्राम बैडोई, परगना जूण्ड में आवाद है।

अतः ग्राम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि श्रीमती रणजीता पत्नी चन्दू राम अपने परिवार ग्राम पंचायत ओडा में रणजीता व उसके पहले पति से लड़का नामक सुरजीत, जन्म तिथि 18-1-1988 का इन्दाज भी अपने परिवार में करना चाहता है। इस बारे किसी को उजर/एतराज हो तो वे अपना उजर असालतन या वकालतन इश्तहार जारी होने की तारीख से एक माह के भीतर कर सकता है अन्यथा परिवार रजिस्टर ग्राम पंचायत ओडा में इन्दाज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

इश्तहार आज दिनांक 1 अप्रैल, 2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर अथवा मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
चुराह, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

In the Court of: Shri D. C. RANA, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Dalhousie, District Chamba, Himachal Pradesh, INDIA

In the Matter of:

1. Ms. Ravinandini Singh d/o Sh. Brajinder Singh, resident of Jandrigat Palace, Dalhousie, Chamba, H. P., India.

2. Mr. Matthew Westlake resident of 377 Mountain River Estate, T3Z, 3J3 Calgary AB Canada..

Versus

General public

Subject: Notice of Intended Marriage dated 10-2-2006 under the Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Whereas, Ms. Ravinandini Singh d/o Sh. Brajinder Singh, resident of Jandrigat Palace, Dalhousie, Chamba, H.P., India and Mr. Matthew Westlake resident of 377 Mountain River Estate, T3Z, 3J3 Calgary AB Canada have issued notice dated 10-2-2006 under the Special Marriage Act, 1954 to the undersigned for the solemnisation of marriage between the two within three calendar months from the date of notice.

Now, therefore, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding solemnisation this marriage can file objection before this Court upto 11 A.M. on or before 9th May, 2006. After that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be solemnised.

Issued on 13th day of March, 2006 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal.

D. C. RANA (H.A.S.),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Dalhousie, District Chamba (H. P.) (INDIA).

ब अदालत श्री संजीव शर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री दीवान चन्द पुत्र श्री भगत राम, निवासी गांव भट्टी, डाकघर सदली, तहसील डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रत्यर्पण।

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय ब्यान हल्फी इस आशय से गूजारा है कि कागजात माल में उसका नाम दीनो राम दर्ज है जो कि गलत है। जबकि उसका सही नाम दीवान चन्द है।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण को बर्जिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी के नाम दस्तुती बारे यदि किसी को कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 8-5-2006 को असालतन या वकालतन अदालत अधोहस्ताक्षरी आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूत में नाम दस्तुती के आवेद दे दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 7-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत मोहर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

संजीव शर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
डलहौजी, जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री प्रार0 के0 शुशी, मैरिज ऑफिसर एवं उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, हमीरपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

1. श्री प्रताप चन्द उम्र 45 वर्ष सुपुत्र श्री खेमो राम, गांव ब शा0 आलमपुर, तहसील जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

के उपरास्त किसी भी प्रकार की धारा 13(3) की कार्य न होगी तथा जन्म पंजीकरण के आदेश सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 22-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व म्यामालय की मोहर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर। जगदीश राम,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
खुण्डिया, जिला कांगडा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री प्रकाश चन्द भाजाव, नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

केस नं० : 21/NT-1/06. तारीख पेनी : 8-5-2006.

प्यार सिंह धीमान बनाम सर्वसाधारण एवं ग्राम जनता।

प्रार्थना-पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री प्यार सिंह धीमान पुत्र श्री राजमल, निवासी घनैटा, तहसील पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसकी लड़की नीलम धीमान का जन्म दिनांक 8-8-1970 को हुआ है। मगर ग्राम पंचायत घनैटा के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है।

अतः इस इशतहार हजा द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 5-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे प्रसातन या बकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। बाद गजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर या एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नीलम धीमान पुत्री श्री प्यार सिंह धीमान की जन्म तिथि 8-8-1970 पंजीकरण करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित पंचायत को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 4-4-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। प्रकाश चन्द भाजाव,
नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री प्रकाश चन्द भाजाव, नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

केस नं० : 18/NT-1/06. तारीख पेनी : 8-5-2006.

श्रीमती भारती प्रानन्द बनाम सर्वसाधारण एवं ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती भारती प्रानन्द पुत्री श्री मनोहर लाल, निवासी मुहाल बाई नं० 7, मीजा पालमपुर, तहसील पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसका स्वयं का जन्म दिनांक 20-10-1977 को हुआ है। मगर म्युनिसिपल कमिटी के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है।

अतः इस इशतहार हजा द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 8-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे प्रसातन या बकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। बाद गजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर या एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा भारती प्रानन्द पुत्री श्री मनोहर लाल की जन्म तिथि 20-10-1977 पंजीकरण करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित म्युनिसिपल कमिटी को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 20-3-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। प्रकाश चन्द भाजाव,
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री प्रकाश चन्द भाजाव, नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

केस नं० : 23/NT-1/06 तारीख पेनी : 8-5-2006

श्री रमेश चन्द धीमान बनाम सर्वसाधारण एवं ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री रमेश चन्द धीमान पुत्र श्री राज मल, निवासी मुहाल घनैटा, मीजा घनैटा, तहसील पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसके लड़के नीलम धीमान का जन्म दिनांक 18-1-1980 को हुआ है मगर ग्राम पंचायत घनैटा के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है।

अतः इस इशतहार हजा द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 5-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे प्रसातन या बकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। बाद गजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर या एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नीलम धीमान पुत्र श्री रमेश चन्द धीमान की जन्म तिथि 18-1-1980 के पंजीकरण आदेश सम्बन्धित पंचायत को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 4-4-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। प्रकाश चन्द भाजाव,
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री प्रकाश चन्द भाजाव, नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

केस नं० : 25/NT-1/06 तारीख पेनी : 5-5-2006

श्री राकेश कुमार बनाम सर्वसाधारण एवं ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री राकेश कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रानन्द राम, निवासी मुहाल घुम्बर, मीजा घुम्बर, तहसील पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसकी लड़की कुमारी सुरभी का जन्म दिनांक 29-1-2002 को हुआ है मगर ग्राम पंचायत घुम्बर के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है।

अतः इस इशतहार हजा द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 5-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे प्रसातन या बकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। बाद गजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर या एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा कुमारी सुरभी पुत्री श्री राकेश कुमार की जन्म तिथि 29-1-2002 के पंजीकरण आदेश सम्बन्धित पंचायत को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 4-4-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। प्रकाश चन्द भाजाव,
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
पालमपुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब प्रवालत श्री केसर राम, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी/कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री मरगतम सिंह पुत्र श्री जगबन्त सिंह, निवासी गांव ब डा0 चडी, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री मरगतम सिंह पुत्र श्री जगबन्त सिंह, निवासी चडी, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय/कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसके पुत्र अभियेक पुत्र मरगतम सिंह का जन्म तिथि 11-12-1982 को मूहान चडी में हुआ है लेकिन जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है।

अतः मंत्रे साधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता कि यदि इस बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 6-5-2006 को प्रमानतन या बकालतन प्रातः 10:00 बजे हाजिर हो कर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई अवतिन/एतराज नहीं मना जाएगा तथा अभियेक की जन्म तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

प्राज्ञ दिनांक 23-3-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदानत में जारी हुआ।

साहूर।

केसर राम,
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, शाहपुर,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब प्रवालत श्री केसर राम, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

श्री मरगतम सिंह पुत्र श्री जगबन्त सिंह, निवासी गांव ब डा0 चडी, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री मरगतम सिंह पुत्र श्री जगबन्त सिंह, निवासी चडी, तहसील शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय/कार्यालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसके पुत्र अभिलेख पुत्र मरगतम सिंह की जन्म तिथि 16-4-1986 को मूहान चडी में ही हुआ है लेकिन उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 6-5-2006 को प्रमानतन या बकालतन प्रातः 10:00 बजे हाजिर होकर पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई अवतिन/एतराज न मना जाएगा तथा अभिलेख की जन्म तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

प्राज्ञ दिनांक 23-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदानत में जारी हुआ।

साहूर।

केसर राम,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
शाहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब प्रवालत श्री राजीव कुमार, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी लाहौल स्थान केलांग, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति, हिमाचल प्रदेश

राम सिंह पुत्र गब0 श्री टली बांग्यान बनाम आम जनता व अन्य

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र बराये पंचायत रजिस्टर में नाम दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री राम सिंह पुत्र गब0 श्री टली बांग्यान, निवासी गोन गुपमक, कोठी गुमरग, तहसील लाहौल ने इस प्रवालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र/पत्र-पत्र सहित दायर किया है कि उसकी बेटी कुमारी मुनीता व पुत्र रमेश कुमार जिनकी जन्म तिथियां क्रमशः 28-8-1982 व 21-9-1986 है का नाम व जन्म तिथियां पंचायत परिवार रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं हैं, के नाम व जन्म तिथियां पंचायत रजिस्टर में दर्ज की जावें।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा समस्त जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त बच्चों के नाम व जन्म तिथियां पंचायत रजिस्टर में दर्ज करने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 5-5-2006 को प्रातः 10:00 बजे इस प्रवालत में प्रमानतन या बकालतन हाजिर होकर पैरवी कर सकता है तथा निश्चित तिथि पर कोई आपत्ति न करने पर एक तरफा कार्यवाही प्रमल में लाई जावेगी।

प्राज्ञ दिनांक 5-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रवालत में जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राजीव कुमार,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
लाहौल स्थान केलांग,
जिला लाहौल स्पिति (हि0 प्र0)।

ब प्रवालत श्री राजीव कुमार, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी लाहौल स्थान केलांग, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति, हिमाचल प्रदेश

प्रेम लाल पुत्र श्री मोनम बनाम आम जनता व अन्य

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र बराये पंचायत रजिस्टर में नाम दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री प्रेम लाल पुत्र श्री मोनम, निवासी गांव करदग, कोठी गुमरग, तहसील लाहौल ने इस प्रवालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र/पत्र-पत्र सहित दायर किया है कि उसकी अपनी जन्म तिथि 25-5-1969 है का नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत परिवार रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं है। अतः अब दर्ज की जावे।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा समस्त जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत रजिस्टर में दर्ज करने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 5-5-2006 को प्रातः 10:00 बजे इस प्रवालत में प्रमानतन या बकालतन हाजिर होकर पैरवी कर सकता है तथा निश्चित तिथि पर कोई आपत्ति न करने पर एक तरफा कार्यवाही प्रमल में लाई जावेगी।

प्राज्ञ दिनांक 5-4-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रवालत में जारी हुआ।

साहूर।

राजीव कुमार,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
लाहौल स्थान केलांग, जिला लाहौल स्पिति (हि0 प्र0)।

ब प्रवालत श्री जगदीश तमो, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, धर्मपुर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री प्रेम चन्द पुत्र श्री चमन लाल, निवासी ब बाकपाता स्योह, उप-तहसील धर्मपुर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रतिवादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

उत्तमान मुकदमा.—प्रार्थना-पत्र दफ्तरी नाम।

प्रार्थी श्री प्रेम चन्द पुत्र श्री चमन लाल, निवासी स्योह, उप-तहसील धर्मपुर ने एक प्रार्थना-पत्र इस प्रवालत में प्रस्तुत

किया है कि उसके पिता का नाम राजेश्वर अग्रिवेल में चमा-
राज वर्ज है जो कि गलत वर्ज चरा था रहा है। जबकि
प्राची के पिता का सही नाम चमत माल है जिसका पट्टि हेतु
प्राची ने अपना ध्यान हटिका, नकल परिचार रजिस्टर व नकल
जमाकर दाखल प्रस्तुत कर रखी है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा हर आम व खास को सूचित किया
जाता है कि यदि किसी को उक्त नाम बदल करने बारे कोई
उत्तर/एतराज हो तो वह बिनाक 8-5-2006 को यथावत या
बकालत हाजिर होकर अपना उत्तर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है।
उसके उपरान्त कोई उत्तर/एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा और
प्रार्थनापत्र का निराकरण निष्पातार कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 3-4-06 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत में
जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

जयदीन जग्गी,
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी धर्मपुर,
जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

य प्रवालन श्री जिनोगी लाल, सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी, जो० नगर,
जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री कश्मीर सिंह पुत्र स्व० श्री मोती राम, निवासी शानन,
तहसील जो० नगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राची।

बनाम

1. श्री टेक चन्द पुत्र श्री निता राम, 2. श्री हंस राज पुत्र
श्री निता राम, 3. श्री लच्छमण पुत्र श्री विनोद सिंह, 4. श्री जगदेव
पुत्र श्री गणपत, सभी निवासी चन्दनोक मण्डी, 5. श्री रंज राज
पुत्र श्री रणवीर राम, निवासी जो० नगर, 6. हिमाचल प्रदेश
सरकार बर्खास्त समाहर्ता मण्डी, जिला मण्डी, 7. श्री भूप सिंह
पुत्र श्री अणू, निवासी शानन।

विषय.—इस्तकाल नं० 82, खार्जी आदेश 17-7-2003 बारे
प्रार्थनापत्र।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उतबानवाला में प्राची श्री कश्मीर सिंह पुत्र
स्व० श्री मोती राम, निवासी शानन, तहसील जो० नगर, जिला
मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने प्रार्थनापत्र गुजारा है। आता नं० 282,
खतोती नं० 57/86 मुहान जालन का इस्तकाल वर्ज करवाना
चाहता है, जिस बारे उपरोक्त फरीकदोयम को समन जारी किये गये
परन्तु फरीकदोयम का सही पता न होने के कारण तामीन नहीं हो
पा रही है। जिससे साफ जाहिर है कि उनकी तामीन सही ढंग
से नहीं हो रही है।

अतः उपरोक्त फरीकदोयम को बर्खास्त इस्तहार राजाज हिमाचल
प्रदेश द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 4-5-2006
को सुबह 10.00 बजे प्रसावतन या बकालत हाजिर आकर
पैरवी मुकद्दमा करे अन्यथा हाजिर न आने की सूत में एक
तरफा कार्यवाही समय में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 9-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर
अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

किशोरी लाल,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
जो० नगर, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)।

प्रवालन कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, जोगिन्दरनगर, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर
जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा

किशोरी लाल मुपुत्र श्री जगत राम, निवासी मछवाल (बल्ह),
ठाकधर बल्ह जोली, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

दरबान्त जेर वका 13(3) नम एवमूय पञ्जीकरण हेतु।

यह उपरावत मुकद्दमे में प्राची श्री किशोरी लाल मुपुत्र श्री जगत
राम, निवासी मछवाल बल्ह, ठाकधर बल्ह जोली, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर,
जिला मण्डी हिमाचल प्रदेश है। प्राची ने इस अदालत में दरबान्त
की है कि उसकी दोपती कामल जहाँ मुपुत्री श्री विनाल गर्मा का
अन्त पञ्चायत रजिस्टर में गलती से वर्ज नहीं करवाया गया है। अब
वर्ज किया जाए। उसकी दोपती का नम 13-10-2002 को
गाव गणेश, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी में हुआ है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों
को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इसका नाम वर्ज करने
बारे आपत्ति या उत्तर हो तो वह दिनांक 5-5-2006 सभा 10:00
बजे प्रातः स्वयं यावता किसी वारित्त के माध्यम से हमारे समक्ष प्रवालन
में हाजिर होकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही समय में
लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 18-4-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर
जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जोगिन्दरनगर, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर,
जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)।

In the Court of Shri Padam Singh Thakur, Civil Judge,
(Senior Division) Karsog, Tehsil Karsog, District Mandi,
Himachal Pradesh

In this matter of :—

1. Mini Devi wife of Shri Dharam Dass, r/o Village
Mahaban, Illaqua Ramgarh, Tehsil Karsog, District
Mandi (H.P.)

2. Minor Diwan Chand son of Late Shri Harpal,
through her next friend her mother r/o Village Mahaban,
Illaqua Ramgarh, Tehsil Karsog, District Mandi,
(H. P.)

Versus

General Public

Application under section 372 of Indian Succession
Act for the grant of Succession Certificate.

Whereas in the above noted case the petitioner has
filed an application in this Court under section 372
of the Indian Succession Act in respect of Rs. 25000/-
as special grant deposited before SDO (Civil) Karsog
sanctioned in favour of the applicants on the sudden
death of Harpal Singh deceased alongwith interest upto
date, any other dues payable by any other financial
institution.

Hence, this proclamation hereby issued to the
General public of the Illaqua and relatives of the
deceased to file objection, if any, on or before 10-6-2006
10.00 A.M. in this court personally or through an
authorized agent/counsel, failing which successions
petition will be heard and disposed of ex parte.

Given under my hand and seal of this court
this 7th day of April, 2006.

Seal.

PADAM SINGH,
Civil Judge (Sr. Division),
Karsog, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh.

य प्रवालन श्री एम० एल० बन्सल, नामक तहसीलदार एव कार्यकारी
दण्डाधिकारी उप-तहसील कोटली, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

निकी देवी

बनाम

आम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती निक्की देवी पत्नी श्री भीष्म, निवासी कोटली, डाकघर कोटली, उप-तहसील कोटली ने इस न्यायालय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है जिसमें प्राग्गह किया है कि प्राप्ति के सड़के गोर सिंह की मृत्यु 28-10-2005 को हुई है। परन्तु मृत्यु तिथि ग्राम पंचायत कोटली में दर्ज नहीं हुई है। मृत्यु पंजीकरण के आदेश दिये जायें।

धतः ग्राम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को इस बारा कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 6-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व प्रसालन व बकालतन हाजिर होकर पेश करें अन्यथा कार्यवाही एक तरफा प्रमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 2-3-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

एस0 एल0 बन्सल,
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप-तहसील कोटली, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

ब प्रदालत श्री किशोरी लाल, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी जोगिन्दरनगर,
जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब मुकद्दमा :

श्री सुनील दत्त पुत्र स्व0 श्री इन्द्र सिंह ठाकुर, निवासी डोल, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0) ... प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता ... प्रत्यार्थी।

आवेदन-पत्र जेर धारा 40/41 भारतीय पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में प्रार्थी श्री सुनील दत्त पुत्र स्व0 श्री इन्द्र सिंह ठाकुर, निवासी डोल, तहसील जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुये निवेदन किया है कि श्री इन्द्र सिंह ने एक बसीयत उनके हक में लिखवाई है जिस पंजीकृत किया जावे।

धतः इस इशतहार द्वारा ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त बसीयत को पंजीकृत करने बारा किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह प्रसालन या बकालतन दिनांक 4-5-2006 का सुबह 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में उपस्थित होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। इसके अतिरिक्त किसी रिश्तेदार/सम्बन्धी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह भी 3-5-2006 को इस अदालत में प्रसालन या बकालतन हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूचना में बसीयत को पंजीकृत करने बारा आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

किशोरी लाल,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जोगिन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

न्यायालय श्री बुधामर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, सरकाघाट,
जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा जीर्णक :

श्री टेक चन्द पुत्र श्री महन्त राम, निवासी मुहाल चनोहली, ईलाका भदरोटा, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0) ... प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता ... फरीकदायम।

प्रार्थना-पत्र दरस्ती नाम मुहाल चनोहली/399.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी श्री टेक चन्द पुत्र श्री महन्त राम, निवासी चनोहली ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र पेश किया है कि उसका सही नाम टेक चन्द है जो उसके शिक्षा तथा पञ्चानत गिर्हाई में सही दर्ज है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख मुहाल चनोहली/399 में गढ़ गलती से गुर प्रसाद दर्ज हुआ है।

धतः ग्राम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त नाम की दरस्ती बारे कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 8-5-2006 को या इससे पूर्व इस न्यायालय में आकर प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा कार्यवाही एक पक्षीय प्रमल में लाई जाकर दरस्ती आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 12-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

बुधामर्मा,
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री पंकज राय, स्पेशल मैरिज अधिकारी (एस0 डी0एम0),
मुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब मुकद्दमा :

(1) श्री कुलदीप सिंह सैन गुपुत्र श्री गुनाब सिंह सैन निवासी चौगान, डा0 पुराना बाजार, तहसील मुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

(2) श्रीमती कल्पना ठाकुर सुपुत्री श्री कंवर सिंह, निवासी जदबारी, डा0 कलौटी, तहसील चड़गांव, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) ... प्रार्थीगण।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता ... प्रतिवादीगण।

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 15 स्पेशल मैरिज ऐक्ट, 1954 के अन्तर्गत विवाह पंजीकरण करने बारे।

उपरोक्त मामला में प्रार्थीगण उपरोक्त ने दिनांक 24-3-2006 को इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र पेश किया है कि उन्होंने दिनांक 1-12-2000 को हिन्दू रीति-रिवाज के अनुसार स्थान कामका माता मन्दिर जै देवी में शादी कर ली है और तब से पति-पत्नी के रूप में रहते चले आ रहे हैं। इसलिए जेर धारा 15 स्पेशल मैरिज ऐक्ट, 1954 के अनुसार उनका विवाह पंजीकृत किया जावे।

धतः ग्राम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को इस बारा कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 8-5-2006 को समय 10.00 बजे सुबह या इससे पूर्व प्रसालन या बकालतन हाजिर अदालत होकर पेश करें अन्यथा दीगर कार्यवाही एक तरफा प्रमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 4-4-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर न्यायालय से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

पंकज राय,
स्पेशल मैरिज अधिकारी,
मुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

PROCLAMATION UNDER ORDER 5, RULE 20, CPC

In the Court of Shri Jai Lal Azad, Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Court No. 1, Rohru, District Shimla

Civil Suit 1/5 of 06

Shri Suraj Parkash s/o Shri Janki Dass, r/o Village Khangter, Tehsil Rohru.

Versus

General Public and others.

Suit for : Application for the grant of Succession Certificate of Late Shri Janki Dass, deceased.

Notice to :

2. Shri Chander Singh, 3. Shri Rai Singh, 4. Shri Baldev Singh all sons of late Shri Janki Dass, r/o Village Khangteri, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla, H. P., 5. Smt. Satya Devi w/o Shri Mohinder Singh, r/o Village Karetli, Tehsil Rohru, 6. Smt. Indira Devi w/o Shri Himat Singh, r/o Village Gadie, Tehsil Rohru, 7. Smt. Usha Devi w/o Shri Surinder Kumar r/o Village Bhalara, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla, H. P., 8. Shri Sandeep Kumar s/o late Shri Pyare Lal, r/o Village Khangteri, Tehsil Rohru, 9. Smt. Liaqu Devi, 10. Smt. Sundlu Devi both wives of Late Shri Janki Dass, r/o Village Khangteri, Tehsil Rohru.

Whereas in the above noted case it has been proved to the satisfaction of the court that above named defendant/defendants is/are avoiding service of summons can not be served in the ordinary way. Hence this proclamation is hereby issued against him/ them to appear in this court 8-5-2006 at 10.00 A.M. to defend the case personally or through an authorised agent or pleader failing which *ex-parte* proceedings will be taken against him/them.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court this 3rd day of April, 2006.

Seal.

JAI LAL AZAD.
Civil Judge Junior Division,
Rohru, District Shimla (H. P.),

ब अदालत श्री गोपाल चन्द, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, टियोग, जिला शिमला (हि 0 प्र 0)

श्रीमती कमला देवी पत्नी श्री सन्त लाल, ग्राम सनैल, ग्राम पंचायत कलबोग, तहसील कोटबाई, जिला शिमला प्राथीया ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी ।

आवेदन-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती कमला पत्नी श्री सन्त लाल, ग्राम सनैल, ग्राम पंचायत कलबोग, तहसील कोटबाई, जिला शिमला, हि 0 प्र 0 ने अपनी पुत्री श्रीमती अनुराधा जिसकी जन्म तिथि 28-2-1983 है को परिवार रजिस्टर ग्राम पंचायत कलबोग में दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा रखा है ।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारा किसी व्यक्ति अथवा रिश्तेदार को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 4-5-2006 को प्रातः 10 बजे हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज पेश करें अन्यथा दीगर कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 27-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

गोपाल चन्द,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
टियोग, जिला शिमला ।

ब अदालत श्री गोपाल चन्द, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी टियोग, जिला शिमला (हि 0 प्र 0)

श्री लायक राम पुत्र श्री राम सिंह, ग्राम पालठ, ग्राम पंचायत सरीवन, तहसील कोटबाई, जिला शिमला प्राथीया ।

ग्राम जनता बनाम श्री प्रेम दास पुत्र श्री माटू राम, निवासी ग्राम देवल टिकरी, डाकघर कुज्जी, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री लायक राम पुत्र श्री राम सिंह, ग्राम पालठ, ग्राम पंचायत सरीवन, तहसील टियोग, जिला शिमला (हि 0 प्र 0) ने अपनी पुत्री गालू जिसकी जन्म तिथि 29-12-2000 है का परिवार रजिस्टर ग्राम पंचायत सरीवन में दर्ज करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा रखा है ।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी व्यक्ति अथवा रिश्तेदार को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 4-5-2006 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज पेश करें अन्यथा दीगर कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 27-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

गोपाल चन्द,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, टियोग,
जिला शिमला (हि 0 प्र 0) ।

ब अदालत श्रीमती सुषमा बत्स, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी पच्छाद, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री श्रीम सिंह सुपुत्र श्री स्वच्छा सिंह, निवासी ग्राम भरमूर, डाकघर ठाकुरद्वारा, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री श्रीम सिंह सुपुत्र श्री स्वच्छा सिंह, निवासी ग्राम भरमूर, डाकघर ठाकुरद्वारा, तहसील पच्छाद ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र सागर सिंह का जन्म मिति 1-4-2001 को हुआ है जिसका इन्दाज ग्राम पंचायत जामन को सेर, तहसील पच्छाद में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है ।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा हर ग्राम व खास को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 6-5-2006 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव, ग्राम पंचायत को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व तिथि दर्ज करने बारे आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे ।

आज दिनांक 25-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

सुषमा बत्स,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
पच्छाद, जिला सिरमौर (हि 0 प्र 0) ।

ब अदालत श्रीमती सुषमा बत्स, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी पच्छाद, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री प्रेम दास सुपुत्र श्री माटू राम, निवासी ग्राम देवल टिकरी, डाकघर कुज्जी, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री प्रेम दास पुत्र श्री माटू राम, निवासी ग्राम देवल टिकरी, डाकघर कुज्जी, तहसील पच्छाद ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र मय शपथ-

सूचक क्रमांक प्रमाणित पाया है कि में १० बीघा काठका १०० मि० की
प्रमाणित वज्रण संकाय सं भूमि न० १० १२३ (३०१७), १२२४
(३०२), १२१५ (५-०५), १२४७/१२४३ (१०४), १२४५
(१-१०), १२४० (६-१२), १२५० (५-१४), १२२० (०१०),
१२२१ (१००), १२३३ (०-१२), १२४० (१-१२), १२४१

(0-16), 1238 (1-01), 1242 (1-07), 1218 (3-13), 1247 (0-16), 1211 (4-00), 1278 (1-08) तथा 120 नं० 1654/1262 (9-02), 1796/1276 (0-12), 1277 (3-00) (12-14 बीघा) का 1/2 भाग 6-07 बीघा तथा 0 नं० 1246 (6-16), 1231 (1-03), 1203 (7-07), 1185 (2-15), 1198 (3-02) कुल तादादी 71-13 बीघा भूमि मोना मानपुरा, तहसील तालागढ़, जिला सोलन पर उद्योग स्थापित करने हेतु स्वीकृति प्रदान की गई थी। यह भी ध्यान में लाया गया है कि कंपनी को कुल 150 बीघा भूमि क्रय करने की अनुमति प्रदान की गई थी परन्तु कंपनी ने केवल 131-4 बीघा भूमि ही क्रय की जो नियम के खिलाफ है तथा कंपनी ने 131-4 बीघा भूमि में से कुछ भूमि विक्रय कर दी और अब कंपनी के पास 71-13 बीघा भूमि ही बकाया में है जबकि उद्योग विभाग ने कंपनी को 150 बीघा भूमि का अनिवार्य प्रमाण-पत्र दिया गया था तथा सरकार ने 150 बीघा भूमि पर दो वर्ष के भीतर उद्योग स्थापित करने की शर्त लगाई थी यह भी प्रतीत होता है कि 100 बीघा कोटेकस प्रा० लि० भूमि का क्रय-विक्रय का कार्य कर रही है जो हिमाचल प्रदेश मृजारियत एवं भू-सुधार अधिनियम की धारा 118 की उल्लंघना है।

तथा चूंकि आप द्वारा जो यह कार्यवाही की गई है वह हिमाचल प्रदेश मृजारियत एवं भू-सुधार अधिनियम की धारा 1972 जिसे हिमाचल प्रदेश मृजारियत एवं भू-सुधार (संशोधित) अधिनियम, 1987 जो दिनांक 14-04-1988 में लागू हो गया है, की अवहेलना है। इस व्यवस्था के अनुसार जो भूमि इस केस में विवादग्रस्त है उस पर बने भवन इत्यादि प्रदेश सरकार को बिना किसी प्रतिघन प्रादि के नाम जन्त की जा सकती है जैसा की संशोधित अधिनियम की धारा 118(3) में व्यवस्था है।

इसलिए आपको इस नोटिस द्वारा एक भौका दिया जाता है कि आप कारण बताए की क्यों न उपरोक्त कानून व्यवस्था के अधीन उपरोक्त भूमि तथा इस पर बने भवन इत्यादि को बहक सरकार जन्त किया जाए। आपको यह भी आदेश दिए जाते हैं कि इन न्यायालय से दिनांक 06-05-2006 को नियमानुसार प्राधिकृत प्रतिनिधि या अधिकृत द्वारा हाजिर आकर अपना उत्तर दस्तावेज सहित दाखिल करें अन्यथा आपके विरुद्ध एकतरफा कार्यवाही प्रमल में लाई जाएगी तथा केस में विधि अनुसार प्रमाणों कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 03-04-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
जिला समाहर्ता,
सोलन, जिला सोलन (हि० प्र०)।

प्रसन्न, तहसीलदार, सोलन, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

इसलिए आपका उत्तर तत्कालीन।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
जिला समाहर्ता,
सोलन, जिला सोलन (हि० प्र०)।

प्रसन्न, तहसीलदार, सोलन, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

तक पेश करें वरन् एकतरफा कार्यवाही प्रमल में लाई जाकर उपरोक्त अराजी की तत्कालीन कर दी जाएगी।

मोहर।
हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार,
सोलन, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री विनय मोदी, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी कण्डाघाट,
जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री भरत राम पुत्र श्री हेत राम, निवासी ग्राम डूह, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन (हि० प्र०)

बनाम
आम जनता

विषय.—प्राथना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री भरत राम पुत्र श्री हेत राम, निवासी ग्राम डूह, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन (हि० प्र०) ने इस न्यायालय में शपथ-पत्र सहित प्राथना-पत्र दिया है कि उसकी पुत्री आशिता की जन्म तिथि 1-1-2001 है जिसका जन्म डूह गांव में हुआ है लेकिन जन्म तिथि समय पर ग्राम पंचायत समन्वय के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवाई जा सकी है। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश जारी किये जायें।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस बारे कोई उज्र या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 10-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस के दिन असातन या बकातन हाजिर अदालत आकर एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा अदम हाजरी में कार्यवाही के तरफा प्रमल में लाई जाएगी और उपरोक्त आशिता का नाम एवं जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धित के रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु को दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
विनय मोदी,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी
कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री विनय मोदी, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, कण्डाघाट,
जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री मदन, कोषाल पुत्र श्री सीता राम, निवासी ग्राम माथरी, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम
आम जनता

प्राथना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री मदन कोषाल पुत्र श्री सीता राम, निवासी ग्राम माथरी, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन (हि० प्र०) ने इस न्यायालय में शपथ-पत्र सहित प्राथना-पत्र दिया है कि उसकी पुत्री कुमारी मुस्कान की जन्म तिथि 30-8-2000 है जिसका जन्म माथरी में हुआ है लेकिन जन्म तिथि समय पर ग्राम पंचायत साथरी के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवाई जा सकी है। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिए जायें।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस बारे कोई उज्र या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 10-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस के दिन असातन या बकातन हाजिर अदालत आकर एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा अदम हाजरी में कार्यवाही के तरफा प्रमल में लाई जाएगी और उपरोक्त कुमारी का नाम एवं जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धित के रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु को दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 10-5-2006 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व किसी भी कार्य दिवस के दिन अमालतन या वकालतन हाज़िर अदालत आकर एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा अदम हाज़री में कार्यवाही यकतरफ़ा अमल में लाई जाएगी और उपरोक्त कुमारी मृतक का नाम एवं जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धित के रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु को दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

विनय मोदी,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन (हि0 प्र0)

व अदालत श्री विनय मोदी, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री प्रेम चन्द पुत्र श्री परस राम, निवासी ग्राम बड़न, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश वादी।

बनाम

अनरल पब्लिक/जनसाधारण

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री प्रेम चन्द पुत्र श्री परस राम, निवासी ग्राम बड़न, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने दरदवास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी माता श्रीमती चायनू पत्नी श्री परस राम, निवासी ग्राम बड़न, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन की मृत्यु दिनांक 8-1-2006 को ग्राम तुन्दल, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन में हुई थी परन्तु किसी कारणों से उपरोक्त मृतक श्रीमती चायनू पत्नी श्री परस राम का मृत्यु इन्द्राज सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत तुन्दल, में नहीं कराया जा सका सका जिसे अब करवाने के आदेश सादर किये जायें।

अतः इस इशतहार राजपत्र द्वारा हर खास व आम को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त मृतक श्रीमती चायनू पत्नी श्री परस राम, निवासी ग्राम बड़न, तहसील कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन का इन्द्राज ग्राम पंचायत तुन्दल, में दर्ज करवाने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 10-5-2006 को प्रातः 10 बजे अमालतन या वकालतन हाज़िर अदालत आकर पेश करें अन्यथा अदम हाज़री गैर हाज़री में कार्यवाही यकतरफ़ा अमल में लाई जायेगी और मृतक उपरोक्त श्रीमती चायनू का मृत्यु इन्द्राज तिथि सम्बन्धित रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु को दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-4-2006 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

विनय मोदी,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
कण्डाघाट, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री अशोक चौहान, तहसीलदार एवं भू-सुधार अधिकारी तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री ओंकार चन्द पुत्र श्री रतन चन्द, निवासी गांव भलेन, तप्पा भुञ्जाली, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र बाबत नाम दस्तूरी कागजात माल ओंकार सिंह की बजाए ओंकार चन्द।

श्री ओंकार चन्द पुत्र श्री रतन चन्द, निवासी गांव भलेन तप्पा भुञ्जाली, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका नाम पंचायत रिकार्ड, स्कूल प्रमाण-पत्र व कागजात माल की जमाबन्दी में ओंकार चन्द दख्खन दर्ज है, परन्तु कागजात माल के शहरा नम्ब में उसका नाम ओंकार सिंह पुत्र रतन चन्द गलत दर्ज चला आ रहा है। इसलिए मेरा नाम कागजात माल के शहरा नम्ब में ओंकार सिंह की बजाए ओंकार चन्द दख्खन दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जावें। जो कि मही है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार मुनादी के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त नाम दख्खती में कोई आपत्ति या एतराज हो तो वह निश्चित तिथि दिनांक 5-5-06 को इस न्यायालय में प्रातः 10.00 बजे अमालतन या वकालतन उपस्थित आकर अपनी आपत्ति या एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। हाज़िर न आने की मूरत में नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 1-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

अशोक चौहान
तहसीलदार एवं भू-सुधार अधिकारी,
तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री पी0 सी0 शर्मा, नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी, दण्डाधिकारी, बंगाणा, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती कान्ता देवी पत्नी श्री रमेश चन्द, निवासी टीका परनोलिया सन्हाल, तप्पा टीहरा, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती कान्ता देवी पत्नी श्री रमेश चन्द, निवासी गांव परनोलिया सन्हाल, तप्पा टीहरा, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी माता श्रीमती दलम्बी देवी पत्नी मिलखी राम की मृत्यु दिनांक 15-12-2005 को हो चुकी है। अज्ञाततावज वह अपनी सास की मृत्यु तिथि ग्राम पंचायत बल्ह में दर्ज न करवा सकी है। इसलिए उसे दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जावें। जो कि मही है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करने में कोई एतराज या आपत्ति हो तो वह निश्चित दिनांक 8-5-2006 को इस न्यायालय में प्रातः 10.00 बजे अमालतन या वकालतन उपस्थित आकर अपनी आपत्ति या एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। हाज़िर न आने की मूरत में नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 31-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

पी0 सी0 शर्मा,
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा नम्बर: जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

बहादुर सिंह

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरदवास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बराम जतना धाम ।

भी महापुत्र सिंह पुत्र भी भरन दाग, निवासी लखौवाल तहसील ऊना, जिला ऊना ने इस म्यागल में बरखास्त हो है कि उसके पुत्र हरजोत सिंह का जन्म गान बसोली में दिनांक 2-2-2008 को हुआ था। परन्तु इस बारे में पंजीकरण के विनाई में पंजीकरण करवाया जा सका । यह पंजीकरण करने के धावेन दे दिए जाये ।

धाम: यह नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त बच्चे के जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एराज हो तो वह दिनांक 8-8-2008 को घन: 10.00 बजे अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष घनाकान या नकालतन हाजिर धाकर येन कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण करने के धावेन दे दिए जायेंगे ।

धाम दिनांक 7-1-2008 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर धवाला द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी वक्ताधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०) ।

व धवाला नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी वक्ताधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकुमा नम्बर इन्तकाल नम्बर 7/2-पंजाब, तहसील ऊना, मकतून-उल-खवरी बराम गुरनाम पुत्र हरनामा पुत्र पुत्र लेख, निवासो पंजाब बहक बरमान ।

उलनाम मुकुमा

नवनी देवी

बनाम

धाम जतना

नोटिस बराम धाम जतना ।

मुकुमा उलनामना में आम जतना को सूचित किया जाता है कि भीमली नवनी देवी विधवा हरनामा जति धधमी, निवासो गांव पंजाब, तहसील व जिला ऊना में धवाला हुआ है बरखास्त वजारी है कि उसका पुत्र गुरनाम पुत्र हरनामा धरना करोक 18 साल से लापता है तथा उसके जोखित होने या न होने का कोई इत्तम न है । इसलिए उसका नरास्त का इत्तकाल बच्चे व तस्वीर करवाया जाय । बाद खानदान गुरनाम पुत्र हरनामा की बरखास्त का इत्तकाल नम्बर 7/2 बहक जायम बरमान तब कर दिया गया है जो कि जेरे फैमला है ।

निहाजा इस नोटिस के माध्यम से आम जतना व सम्बन्धी रिश्तेदारों को इत्तनात हो जानी है कि यदि किसी को उक्त इत्तकाल लापता

गुरनाम के नाम व नारायण के नाम तस्वीर होने में कोई उजर/एराज हो तो वह धवाला/नकालतन अवगत हुआ में दिनांक 3-8-2008 घन: 10.00 बजे या इसके पूर्व हाजिर धाकर येन कर सकता है अन्यथा बाद में कोई भी उजर/एराज काबिले गौर नहीं होगा तथा इत्तकाल का फैमला तब जायता कर दिया जायगा ।

धाम दिनांक 4-4-2008 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर धवाला द्वारा जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं महायक समाहता
हिमोन येनी ऊना, जिला ऊना,
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व धवाला नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी वक्ताधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

भी बलबिहारी सिंह

बनाम

धाम जतना

बरखास्त जेरे धाम 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम धाम जतना ।

भी बलबिहारी सिंह पुत्र भी बलभीन सिंह, निवासी गांव बसोली, तहसील ऊना, जिला ऊना ने इस म्यागल में बरखास्त हो है कि उसके पुत्र बिजय सिंह का नाम पंजायत रजिस्टर में नवनी से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है । यह दर्ज करवाया जाये । उसके पुत्र का नाम बिजय सिंह है, जन्म तिथि 12-12-1999 तथा बच्चे का जन्म स्थान बसोली है ।

धन: इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जतना तथा सम्बन्धी रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त बच्चे का नाम दर्ज होने में कोई धागति हो तो वह दिनांक 8-8-2008 को मुबन 10.00 बजे स्वयं घवना धवालातन या नकालतन इस घवालातन में हाजिर धाकर येन कर सकता है अन्यथा एक तरफत कारीबाही अमल में लाई धाकर धवालातन जारी करने के धावेन दे दिए जायेंगे ।

धाम दिनांक 8-4-2008 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर धवाला द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी वक्ताधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०) ।

भाग 6—भारतीय राजपत्र द्वारा विधे में से पुनः प्रकाशन

कृष-

भाग 7—भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिकृतताएं तथा धाम निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिकृतताएं

-कृष-

अनुपूरक

-कृष-

भाग-1

नायब नायब बिनाम

पश्चिमूचना

विनमा-2, 30 मार्च, 2008

धामा किम-जी० (1) -2/2008 धन: हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह धनीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार की

सरकारी धाम पर सार्वजनिक धनोपजन हेतु नामत: तीर्थन घाटी की बजार तहसील में काडीधार पंजायत के नामनी नामक धाम पर ग्राउंट मछली काम के निर्माण हेतु धूमि धनित करनी धनेगित है । धमाध धनधारा यह धधधधित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिमेध में जेना कि निम्न बिबरनी में धिधधध धिया गया है, उपरोक्त धधधध के लिए धूमि का धधध धधधधन है ।

2. यह धधधधध धधधध धधधधध को, जो इससे सम्बधधधध

हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि धर्मन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त नितियों का प्रयोग करने हुए राजपल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और व्यक्तियों को हज़ारों की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा जग धारा द्वारा अधीक्षण अथवा अनुमति प्राप्त सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहज प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी निम्नलिखित व्यक्ति, जिसे उपर परिच्छेद में वर्णित भूमि के धर्मन पर कोई धारणा हो, तो वह इस अधिनियम के प्रकाशित होने के तीस (30) दिन की अवधि के भीतर निम्नलिखित रूप में उप-सम्भाग अधिकारी (नागरिक), बंगलूर, जिला कुल्लू के समक्ष अपनी धारणा दायर कर सकता है।

विस्तृत विवरण		मालिक : बंगलूर	
गाँव	खसरा नं०	खेत	बीघा बिस्वा
हामनी	2210/758	0	02
	758	2	03
	2497/2211/758	1	19
	2499/2211/758	1	18
	2448/2211/758	1	18
कुल .. 5		5	00

सादेन द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
सचिव।



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

खण्ड: 54	शिमला, रविवार, 6 मई, 2006/16 बैशाख, 1928	संख्या : 6
	विषय सूची	
भाग-1	वैधानिक नियमों का छोड़कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि	174 207
भाग-2	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि	207 208
भाग-3	अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, कार्टेनैशियन कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर-प्राक-इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित प्रादेश इत्यादि	208—214
भाग-4	स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाऊन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग	—
भाग-5	वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन	214—224
भाग-6	भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन	—
भाग-7	भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं	—
—	अनुपूरक	—

6 मई, 2006/16 बैशाख, 1928 को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित विज्ञप्तियां 'प्रसाधारण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुईं:—

विज्ञप्ति की संख्या	विभाग का नाम	विषय
No. LLR-E(9)-5/2006-Leg., dated the 3rd May, 2006.	Law Department	Notification regarding to repeal the Punjab Law Department Manual, 1934 in its application to the State of Himachal Pradesh, with effect from 15th May, 2006.
No. YYS B (6) 1/95, dated the 28th April, 2006.	Youth Services and Sports Department	Corrigendum regarding the R & P Rules for the Post of Director, Mountaineering and Allied Sports, Manali.

भाग 1. वैधानिक नियमों की खोजकर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि
हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla 1 the 12th April, 2006

No 1110/15 21/4us/Accets 2000 7692 It is hereby notified that the Honble Mr. Justice Kuldip Chaudhary has relinquished the charge of the office of the Judge, High Court of Himachal Pradesh in the forenoon of 12th April, 2006 on attaining the age of superannuation.

By order.

ARUNA KAPOOR
Registrar (General).

Shimla 1 the 12th April, 2006

No 1110/GA2/14 53/74 IV 7556 60 In the interest of administration, following transfers and postings of the Officers of the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges are hereby ordered with immediate effect :—

1. Shri D. C. Chaudhary, President, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum Mandi on recall and repatriation from the Government of Himachal Pradesh is posted as District and Sessions Judge, Kullu *vice* Shri B. R. Chandel, Sl No. 2 below.
2. Shri B. R. Chandel, District and Sessions Judge, Kullu is transferred and posted as District and Sessions Judge, Hamirpur *vice* Shri Shamsher Singh who has been appointed as President, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Mandi *vide* Government Notification No. F-15-B(2)-3/2006, dated 4th/5th April, 2006.
3. Services of Shri P. S. Rana, President, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Dharamshala on recall and repatriation from the Government of Himachal Pradesh, are placed at the disposal of Hon'ble the Chief Justice for being posted as Registrar (Inspection), High Court of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla against vacant post.
4. Services of Shri R. K. Mittal, Administrative Officer, Himachal Pradesh State Legal Services Authority, Shimla (newly appointed Additional District Judge *w. e. f.* 5/9/2003 *vide* Government Notification No. Home B(A) 1/95, dated 5th April, 2006) on recall and repatriation from the Himachal Pradesh State Legal Authority, Shimla are placed at the disposal of the Government of Himachal Pradesh for being appointed and posted as Special Secretary (Law) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla against a vacant post.
5. Shri Bishil Kukreja, Additional District and Sessions Judge (I), Kangra at Dharamshala is transferred and posted as District and Sessions Judge, Kinnaur at Rampur *vice* Shri C. B. Barowalia who has been appointed and posted as President, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Dharamshala *vide* Government Notification No. F-15-B(2)-3/2006, dated 4th/5th April, 2006.
6. Shri D. K. Sharma, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Shimla is transferred and posted as Additional District and Sessions Judge (I), Kangra at Dharamshala *vice* Shri Bishil Kukreja, Sl No. 5 above.
7. Shri A. S. Jaswal, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Mandi is transferred and posted

as Additional District and Sessions Judge, Sirmour at Nahar against vacant post.

8. Shri Pitam Singh, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Solan (*ad hoc* basis), who has been promoted and appointed as such on regular basis *vide* Government Notification No. Home B(A) 1/95, dated 5th April, 2006 shall continue as such at Solan.
9. Shri R. I. Azad, Presiding Officer, Fast Track Court, Chumbarwin (newly promoted and appointed Officer to the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges on regular basis *vide* Government Notification No. Home B(A) 1/95, dated 5th April, 2006) is transferred and posted as Additional District and Sessions Judge, Mandi *vice* Shri A. S. Jaswal, Sl No. 7 above.
10. Shri S. I. Sharma, Presiding Officer, Fast Track Court, Hamirpur (newly promoted and appointed Officer to the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges on regular basis *vide* Government Notification No. Home B(A) 1/95 dated 5th April, 2006) is transferred and posted as Additional District and Sessions Judge, Shimla *vice* Shri D. K. Sharma Sl No. 6 above.
11. Shri K. S. Chandel, Presiding Officer, Fast Track Court, Una on promotion and appointment as Additional District and Sessions Judge, purely on *ad hoc* basis against the existing vacancy on direct recruits (till selection and appointment by way of direct recruitment is made), is transferred and posted as Additional District and Sessions Judge (2) Kangra at Dharamshala against a vacant post.
12. Shri D. S. Khenal, Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.) cum-Chief Judicial Magistrate, Solan, who has been promoted and appointed as presiding Officer, Fast Track Court, on *ad hoc* basis in the rank of Additional District and Sessions Judge *vide* Government Notification No. Home B(A) 1/95, dated 5th April, 2006 is transferred and posted as presiding Officer, Fast Track Court, Kullu against a vacant post.
13. Shri A. C. Thadwal, Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.) cum-Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bilaspur who has been promoted and appointed as Presiding Officer, Fast Track Court on *ad hoc* basis in the rank of Additional District and Sessions Judge *vide* Government Notification No. Home B(A) 1/95, dated 5th April, 2006 is transferred and posted as Presiding Officer, Fast Track Court, Hamirpur *vice* Shri S. I. Sharma, Sl No. 10 above.
14. Shri C. I. Kochhar, Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.) cum-Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kinnaur at Reckong Poo, who has been promoted and appointed as Presiding Officer, Fast Track Court on *ad hoc* basis in the rank of Additional District and Sessions Judge *vide* Government Notification No. Home B(A) 1/95, dated 5th April, 2006) is transferred and posted as presiding Officer, Fast Track Court, Una *vice* Shri K. S. Chandel Sl No. 11 above.
15. Shri A. K. Sharma, Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.) cum-Chief Judicial Magistrate, Una who has been promoted and appointed as Presiding Officer, Fast Track Court on *ad hoc* basis in the rank of Additional District and Sessions Judge *vide* Government Notification No. Home B(A) 1/95, dated 5th April 2006 is transferred and posted as Presiding Officer, Fast Track Court, Chumbarwin *vice* Shri R. I. Azad, Sl No. 9 above.

Date	Paper/Subject	Time
Monday June 26, 2006	Criminal Law	10 AM to 1 PM
	Civil Law	2 PM to 5 PM
Tuesday June 27, 2006	Revenue Law I	10 AM to 1 PM
	Revenue Law II	2 PM to 5 PM
Wednesday June 28, 2006	Accounts	10 AM to 1 PM
	Constitutional Law	2 PM to 5 PM

શીલ 1	અસર નંબર 2	કેશ કોષા નિરવા	
		3	4
સુધાની	435/1	0	2

*गांव कुडेर, तहसील भटियात, जिला चम्बा में जल पम्पाइर टैंक के निर्माण हेतु।

संख्या सिचार्ड 11-35/2006-चम्बा।

शिमला-2, 7 अप्रैल, 2006.

1	2	3	4
कुडेर 10 नं० 165	15/1	0	8

*गांव ककीरा जरीई, तहसील भटियात, जिला चम्बा में पेयजल योजना जल पम्पाइर टैंक के निर्माण हेतु।

संख्या सिचार्ड 11-34/2006-चम्बा।

शिमला-2, 7 अप्रैल, 2006.

ककीरा जरीई	1016	0	3
शिमला-2, 27 फरवरी, 2006			

संख्या सिचार्ड 11-2/2006-कांगड़ा। -यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को अपने व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन के लिए नामतः गांव ठाकुर-द्वारा, तहसील इन्दौरा, जिला कांगड़ा में शाहनहर परियोजना बायां किनारे के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिसर में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निदिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित है या हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और अधिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने तथा सर्वेक्षण करने और उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित प्रथम धनमत सभी अन्य कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. अत्याधिक आवश्यकता को दृष्टि में रखते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (4) के अधीन यह भी निर्देश देते हैं कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6-ए के उपबन्ध इस मामले में लागू नहीं होंगे :—

विस्तृत विवरणी

जिला : कांगड़ा तहसील : इन्दौरा

गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (हेक्टेयरों में)
1	2	3
ठाकुरद्वारा	378/1	0 00 36
	377/1	0 04 62
	373/1	0 01 50
	345/1	0 00 42
	345/2	0 00 27
	351/1	0 04 65
	315/1	0 00 27
	249/1	0 00 17
	316/1	0 02 36
	379	0 14 64
	350	0 03 12
	316/3	0 02 01
	346	0 00 74
	347	0 00 39
	348	0 00 55
	349	0 02 38
	57	0 06 60
	58/1	0 01 61
	52/1	0 04 41
	52/2	0 02 56
	51/1	0 04 44
	40/1	0 05 82

कुल .. 22 0 63 89

शिमला-2, 7 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या सिचार्ड 11-31/2006-शिमला। यतः राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव रामपुर, तहसील च जिला शिमला में उठाऊ पेयजल योजना भूदान-तालम रामपुर के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिसर में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निदिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित है या हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और अधिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने तथा सर्वेक्षण करने और उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित प्रथम धनमत सभी अन्य कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितवन्ध व्यक्ति जिसे उक्त परिसर में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के 30 दिनों की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-अर्जन महाहर्ता, शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग को समस्त अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है :—

विस्तृत विवरणी

जिला : शिमला तहसील : शिमला (ग्राम)

गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र बीघा विस्वा
रामपुर	968	0 18
	969	0 9
	970	15 13
कुल .. 3		17 0

शिमला-2, 7 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या सिचार्ड 11-30/2006-सोलन। यतः राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव घुमसी-बाह्यणा, तहसील कसौली, जिला सोलन में उठाऊ पेयजल योजना स्टोरेज टैंक के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है, अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिसर में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निदिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित है या हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि-अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और अधिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने तथा सर्वेक्षण करने और उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित प्रथम धनमत सभी अन्य कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितवन्ध व्यक्ति, जिसे उक्त परिसर में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो, तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के तीस दिनों की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-अर्जन महाहर्ता, शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग को समस्त अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है :—

विस्तृत विवरणी

जिला : सोलन तहसील : कसौली

गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र बीघा विस्वा
घुमसी-बाह्यणा	551	2 1

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
प्रधान सचिव।

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

AWARD

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, the 13th July, 2005

No. Shram (A) 7-1/2005. In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 17(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of Awards in the H. P. Rajpatra announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Shimla of the following cases :

Sl. No. & Case No.	Title of the Case
1 2	3
16. Ref. No. 143/01 RBT No. 170/04	Hoshuar Singh Vs. Chairman, Baba Balak Nath Deot Sidh, District Hamirpur.
17. Ref. No. 4/01 RBT No. 199/04	Amar Singh Vs. DFO, Bilaspur.
18. Ref. No. 317/01 RBT No. 149/01	Punjab Singh Vs. Tehsil Palampur Co-operative Marketing and Consumer Society Ltd., Maranda, through its Manager, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra.
19. Ref. No. 40/2002 RBT No. 241/04	Mukosh Kumar Vs. XEN, HPPWD, Salooni, District Chamba.
20. Ref. No. 88/02 RBT No. 151/04	Kuldeep Kumar Vs. Tehsil Palampur Co-operative Society Maranda, Tehsil Palampur.
21. Ref. No. 119/02 RBT No. 150/04 23-2-2005.	Ramush Chand Vs. Management of Tehsil Palampur Co-operative and Consumer Society Ltd., Maranda, Tehsil Palampur.
22. Ref. No. 44/01 RBT No. 29/04	Joginder Pal Vs. XEN, HPSEB, Dharampur, District Mandi.
23. Ref. No. 72/02 RBT No. 113/04	Manoj Kumar Vs. Manager, Tehsil Co-operative Marketing and Consumer Society Ltd., Maranda, Tehsil Palampur.
24. Ref. No. 385/02 RBT No. 394/04	Mohan Singh Vs. XEN, HPSEB, Jogindernagar, District Mandi.

By order,

Sd/-
Secretary.

Certified copy of Award dated 16-5-2005 passed by Hon'ble George, Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, H. P. (Camp at Hamirpur).

Reference No. 143/2001 (RBT No. 170/04)

Instituted on 27-7-2001

Decided on 16-5-2005

Hoshuar Singh son of Shri Krishan Kumar alias Krishan Lal, resident of village Jarjarad, P. O. Pealli-Jarjari, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh

Vs.

The Chairman, Baba Balak Nath Temple Trust, Deot Sidh, Tehsil Barsar, cum-Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil) Sub-Division, Barsar, District Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh.

"Reference under section 10-D of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947".

For the petitioner : Shri S. S. Sippy, AR

For the respondent : Shri J. C. Kaushal, Advocate.

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate Government :

"Whether the retrenchment of Shri Hoshuar Singh workman s/o Shri Krishan Kumar, Village Jarjari, P. O. Roalli Jarjari, Barsar, District Hamirpur, by Chairman, Baba Balak Nath Temple Trust, Deot Sidh, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur, Sub-Divisional Officer, Barsar (Civil) Sub-Division, Barsar, District Hamirpur vide retrenchment order, dated 6-11-1998, complying Sec in 25 (F) and without complying section 25 (N) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 w. e. f. 16-12-1998 is legal and justified. If not, to what relief of back wages, seniority service benefits and amount of compensation the above workman is entitled ?"

2. The petitioner Hoshuar Singh filed his statement of claim seeking relief of re-instatement alongwith consequential relief of back wages and allied service benefits. He claimed that he was employed by the respondent as a "Bijli Karamchhari" (Electrician) on 10-3-1997. Though no formal appointment letter was issued yet he was enrolled as such on the muster roll issued by the respondent in every month during his service tenure with the respondent and he performed the duties of Electrician in order to maintain uninterrupted power supply and maintain electrical appliances for the same. The petitioner further pleaded that he was disengaged from the service by the respondent without adhering to the relevant provisions of law and aggrieved from the order of dis-engagement, the petitioner filed writ petition in the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh, which was disposed of on 1-9-1998 and disengagement was declared illegal and void. The petitioner did his duties with the respondent continuously, without any interruption and break in service by providing service as Electrician. The respondent terminated the services of the petitioner w. e. f. 16-12-1998 vide notice dated 6-11-1999 and the petitioner assailed the order of termination by raising an industrial dispute. No settlement could be arrived at between the parties during the conciliation proceedings and the appropriate government referred the matter to this court for adjudication. The petitioner has been terminated from service most illegally, arbitrarily and for patently false reasons as the work which was being performed by the petitioner was of continuous nature and is still continuing. The respondent has victimised the petitioner for no real fault on his part. The respondent with a view to deprive the petitioner from attaining the status of permanent workman, has sacked the petitioner from service to defect and frustrate orders of the Hon'ble High Court of H. P. under the grab of retrenchment. The respondent while terminating the service of the petitioner, has not adhered to the principle of last come first go, as persons juniors to the petitioner have been retained and several fresh hands have been recruited by the respondent after the termination of service of the petitioner namely Shri Kashmir Singh, Vijay Kumar etc. The petitioner further alleged that the respondent has indulged in an unfair labour practice by treating him unfairly and illegally and the order of termination of service is also hit by article 14 of the Constitution besides various provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. The termination of the petitioner is highly unjust, improper, illegal, void being inoperative in the eyes of law and prayed for re-instatement in service alongwith consequential relief of back wages and allied service benefits.

3. The respondent filed reply raising the preliminary objection that the petitioner was engaged temporarily on daily wages for doing different kind of duties during Navratras mela days without observing codal formalities, on his simple application with verbal direction given to him, that when there will be no work, his services will be terminated, it was a stop gap arrangement only to cope with the additional work which had increased on account of Navratras melas and not

against the sanctimonious strength of the Trust. HUN Temple Thastrali, the petitioner was engaged to perform multifarious duties and not as Hiji Karamchani (Electrician). The petitioner along with others had filed civil writ petition under section 226 of the Constitution of India in the Hon'ble High Court of H.P. Shimla. It was held in judgement dated 1-9-1998 announced by the Hon'ble High Court of H.P. Shimla that in case there was no work available to continue engaging the petitioner, in such eventuality the Trust was required to retrench the petitioner by following the provisions of section 25L of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter) referred in short as the Act) and the disengagement of the petitioner as daily wage worker by the Trust except those who have not completed 240 days is set aside and those who have completed 240 days continued to be in the employment of the Trust, as daily wage workers with all consequential benefits, till they are disengaged in accordance with law. Those bringing work against which the petitioner could be deputed on daily wages, as such, retrenchment notice u/s 25L of the Act was served upon him vide notice No. 880/10/8100 dated 6-11-1998 and higher amount of retrenchment compensation Rs. 1530/- was offered to him, though he was entitled to only 15 days salary of every completed year of service, the service of the petitioner was terminated w.e.f. 15-12-1998 after complying with sec. 25L of the Act.

4. On merits, the respondent pleaded that the petitioner was engaged purely on temporary basis on his simple application for doing different kind of duties during mela days and not as Hiji Karamchani (Electrician) as stated, with the verbal directions given to him that when there will be no work, his services will be terminated. The respondent averred that construction work undertaken then, was stayed under the order of the Civil Court, District Judge, Hamirpur, therefore, it was not possible to allot work to the petitioner, and other daily waged employees, who were only engaged on temporary basis considering exigencies of work and need of the hour. Besides, this the main rush of pilgrims in mela days, the petitioner was junior most daily wage worker who has been working with breaks intermittently, hence disengaged from services. It is also not admitted as correct that the Hon'ble High Court of H.P. Shimla, vide their judgment dated 1-9-1998, has decided that the disengagement of the petitioner was declared as illegal and void. The respondent denied that the petitioner has been victimised and sacked from service to defeat and frustrate the order of the Hon'ble High Court of H.P. Shimla. The petitioner was engaged for doing different kinds of duties work, the construction work undertaken then, was stayed under the order of Civil Court, District Judge, Hamirpur, therefore, it was not possible to allot work to him. The respondent also denied that the principle of last come first go has not been adhered to. The respondent denied all other assertions made by the petitioner in the claim petition and prayed for the dismissal of the claim petition.

5. The petitioner filed rejoinder where in the facts pleaded by the respondent in their reply are not admitted as correct and the facts pleaded in the statement of claim are reiterated.

6. On the respective assertions of the parties, the following issues were framed for decision on 25.5.2000.

1. Whether the retrenchment of petitioner by respondent without complying with the provisions of section 25L and 25N of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified. OPP
2. If issue No. 1 is not proved, to what relief of service benefits including back wages, seniority and amount of compensation the petitioner is entitled to? OPP
3. Relief

7. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my issue-wise findings are as under.

Issues No. 1
Issue No. 2

Relief

The petition is allowed as per operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE No. 1 and 2.

8. Both these issues being interconnected and interlinked, are taken up together for discussion and decision.

9. The petitioner, Shri Hashraf Singh, in order to prove both these issues appeared himself as PW1, and he stated that he was engaged as daily waged worker by the respondent, w.e.f. 10-1-1997 and he worked as a "Hiji Karamchani" upto 16-12-1998, thereafter, his services were terminated after retaining his juniors namely, Kachhu Singh, Vijay Kumar, and Vikram Jod Singh, Ravi Datt Sharma etc. The petitioner has stated that he is an employed and prayed for his reinstatement with all consequential benefits. In his cross examination he admitted that he was appointed on the muster roll and he also confirmed that he received a notice from the respondent after 10 days of his retrenchment. He admitted that he received a sum of Rs. 1530/- alongwith said notice. But has shown his ignorance on what account this amount has been paid to him by the respondent.

10. To controvert the evidence of the respondent, the respondent has examined Shri Raj Kumar, Junior Assistant Baba Balak Nath Trust, Doot Sidh, Hamirpur who has stated that the petitioner's services were terminated by notice Ex. RW1/A and he was paid an amount of Rs. 1530/- alongwith cheque which was accepted by the petitioner. The petitioner was working as daily waged and his services were terminated after doing all codal formalities. In his cross-examination he has shown his ignorance that the petitioner worked from 10-1-1997 to 16-12-1998. Though he admitted that work against which he was employed is of regular nature and for that the respondent has kept employees. He also admitted that strength of workers and other employees of the respondent, are more than 121 persons. Though he has shown his ignorance about the twenty years muster plan of the respondent/trust. He has stated that reason for retrenchment has been shown in the notice Ex. RW1/A. This notice was served upon the petitioner by hand. He has shown his ignorance about the fact that section 25N of the Act, was complied with or not. He has shown ignorance about the fact that juniors to the petitioner were retained at the time when the petitioner was disengaged and are still working in the trust. The perusal of notice Ex. RW1/A reveals that respondent has admitted that the petitioner was working on daily waged basis in the Baba Balak Nath Trust, and doing different jobs in the temple and outside the temple. Cause of retrenchment is also given in the notice i.e., "There is no work against which can be deputed to work on daily wages, therefore, he is retrenched and notice of retrenchment given to the petitioner as his services are no longer required and stands disengaged on 15-12-1998 and he should not report for duty w.e.f. 16-12-1998 onwards. Notice Ex. RW1/A also reveals that retrenchment compensation of Rs. 1530/- was also tendered to the petitioner. This retrenchment compensation as it appears from the endorsement on the notice Ex. RW1/A was received by the petitioner on 1-12-1998. As per requirement of section 25L of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, under which the respondent issued notice of retrenchment, which reads as under.

Section 25L

"No workman employed in any industry who has been continuous service for not less than one

year under an employer shall be retrenched by the employer until

- (a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reason for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice wages for the period of the notice;
- (b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay (for every completed year of continuous service) or any part thereof in excess of six months;
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette).

११. According to sub-clause (a) of section 25-F, the workman is required to be given one month's notice in writing. It appears that though notice Pt. RWI/A was typed and it was signed on 6.11.1998 but was received by the petitioner on 1.12.1998. It means that the condition of notice of one month, as laid down in sub-clause (a) is not complied with. If the petitioner has received notice on 1.12.1998 and his discharge came into effect from 15.12.1998 or to say 16.12.1998, as such it does not fulfil the condition of one month's notice as laid down in clause (a) of section 25-F.

१२. Similarly, retrenchment compensation is required to be paid to the workman in a similar manner and as per clause (c), the respondent is required to give notice in a prescribed manner to the appropriate government with regard to the retrenchment of a workman. It appears that the respondent has not complied with the conditions enumerated in section 25-F, (b) & (c) as well which are conditions precedent. The provisions of section 25-F (a), (b) and (c) are couched in mandatory form and non-compliance therewith has the result of rendering the order of retrenchment, void, *ab initio* or non set.

१३. It has come in the evidence of the respondent, as the facts admitted by Shri. Raj Kumar (RWI) that the respondent has employed workman more than 101 in number and the fact that the petitioner continued to work not less than one year, is also not in dispute. In these circumstances the respondent was required not only to comply with the mandatory requirement of section 25-F of the Act, but also the provisions contained in Chapter V-B of the Act, as section 25-K reads with section 25-N of the Act and section 25-K and 25-N reads as under:-

Section 25-K :

Application of Chapter V-B (1) the provisions of this Chapter shall apply in an industrial establishment (Not being an establishment of a seasonal character or in which work is performed only intermittently in which not less than one hundred workmen were employed in an average per working day for the preceding twelve months)

- (2) If a question arise whether an Industrial establishment is of a seasonal character or whether the work is performed therein only intermittently the decision of appropriate government thereon shall be final

Section 25-N :

25-N conditions precedent to retrenchment of Workman :

No workman employed in any industrial establishment to which this chapter applies who had been in continuous service for not less than one

year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until

- (a) the workman has been given three months notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice wages for the period of the notice and
- (b) the prior permission of the appropriate Government or such authority as may be specified by that Government by notification in the official gazette (hereinafter in this section referred to as the specified authority) has been obtained on an application made in this behalf

- (2) An application for permission under sub-clause (1) shall be made by the employer in the prescribed manner stating clearly the reason for the intended retrenchment and a copy of such application shall also be served simultaneously on the workman concerned in the prescribed manner
- (3) Where an application for permission under sub-section (1) has been made the appropriate Government or the specified authority, after making such enquiry as it thinks fit and after giving a reasonable opportunity of being heard to the employer, the workman concerned and the person interested in such retrenchment may having regard to the genuineness and adequacy of the reasons stated by the employer the interests of the workmen and all other relevant factors, by order and for reasons to be recorded in writing grant or refuse to grant such permission and a copy of such order shall be communicated to the employer and the workman
- (4) Where an application for permission has been made under sub-section (1) and the appropriate Government or the specified authority does not communicate the order granting or refusing to grant permission to the employer within a period of sixty days from the date on which such application is made, the permission applied for shall be deemed to have been granted on the expiration of the said period of sixty days
- (5) An order of the appropriate Government or the specified authority granting or refusing to grant permission shall subject to the provisions of a sub-section (6) be final and binding on all the parties concerned and shall remain in force for one year from the date of such order
- (6) The appropriate Government or the specified authority may either on its own motion or on the application made by the employer or any workman review its order granting or refusing to grant permission under sub-section (3) or refer the matter or as the case may be cause it to be referred to, a Tribunal for adjudication
- (7) Where no application for permission under sub-section (1) is made, or where the permission for any retrenchment has been refused such retrenchment shall be deemed to be illegal from the date on which the notice of retrenchment was given to the workman and the workman shall be entitled to all the benefits under any law for the time being in force as if no notice had been given to him
- (8) notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing provisions of this section the appropriate Government may if it is satisfied that owing to such exceptional circumstances as accident in the establishment or death of the employer or the like it is necessary so to do, by order, direct that the provisions of sub-section (1)

shall not apply in relation to such establishment for such period as may be specified in the order.

- (9) Where permission for retrenchment has been granted under sub-section (3) or where permission for retrenchment is deemed to be granted under sub-section (4) every workman who is employed in that establishment immediately before the date of application for permission under this section shall be entitled to receive at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months."

14. Bare perusal of section 25 K and N reveals that since the respondent has employed more than 100 workmen on an average per working day for the preceding twelve months, therefore, the respondent has required to comply with the mandatory requirement of clause (a) and (b) of sub-section 1 of section 25N of the Act. The respondent has not given three months notice in writing indicating the reason for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice wages for the period of the notice or prior permission of the appropriate government or such authority as may be specified by notification in the official gazette has been obtained on an application made in this behalf.

15. It is well settled that non-compliance of section 25-N of the Act, automatically results dis-engagement of a workman illegal and un-justified. It is incumbent upon the management to prove that a copy of application as required by section 25-N, was served on the concerned workman. In the present case the respondent has not complied with the required mandatory provisions of section 25-F (a) & (c) and also has not complied with the provisions of section 25-N of the Act and therefore, retrenchment of the petitioner w. e. f. 16-12-1998 as per notice Ex. RW1/A is not only illegal but also un-justified. It appears from the evidence of the petitioner who appears as PW1 that at the time when his services were retrenched w. e. f. 16-12-1998 his juniors workmen namely Kashmir Singh, Vikram Singh, Vijay Kumar, Ravi Dutt Sharma, etc. This fact is not contradicted by the respondent in the cross-examination of the petitioner. Rather, Shri Raj Kumar (RW1) while appearing on behalf of the respondent has shown his ignorance in the last line of his cross-examination by saying that "I cannot say that juniors to the petitioner are working in the Trust", meaning thereby the stand taken by the petitioner that though his services were retrenched but the persons junior to him were retained in service remains un-shattered. It can safely be concluded on the basis of evidence available on the record that at the time when the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged by the respondent, principle of last come, first go, is not adhered to by the respondent, as such the services of the petitioner were dis engaged in violation of section 25-G, which reads as under:-

Procedure for retrenchment :

"Where any workman in an industrial establishment who is a citizen of India, is to be retrenched and he belongs to a particular category of workmen in that establishment in the absence of any agreement between the employer and the workman in this behalf the employer shall ordinarily retrench the workman who was the last person to be employed in that category unless for reasons to be recorded the employer retrenches any other workman"

16. Since the respondent has violated the provisions of section 25-F (a) & (c) and also section 25-N read with section 25-K and 25-G) of the Act, therefore, termination of the petitioner w. e. f. 16-12-1998 is illegal and un justified being violative of the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and since the petitioner has

stated that he remained un-employed from the date of his dis-engagement, therefore, the petitioner becomes entitled for all service consequential benefits including seniority. Both these issues are decided accordingly in favour of the petitioner.

RETRIEF.

17. In view of my findings on issues No. 1 and 2 above, since the termination of the service of the petitioner by the respondent is without complying the conditions precedent laid down under section 25-F (a) & (c) as well as section 25-G, H and N of the Act, therefore, the petitioner is entitled for his reinstatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his termination. The respondent has not brought on the record that the petitioner was in gainful employment after his retrenchment till date, as such having regard to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is held entitled for all consequential service benefits and back wages to the extent of 50%. The respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner within a period of 90 days from the date of announcement of this award, failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full back wages till his re-engagement.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the Official Gazette. The file after completion be consigned to record room.

Announced.

Seal.

Sd/-
(GEORGE),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Dharmshala (H. P.).

Certified copy of award dated 13-5-2005 passed by Shri George, Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharmshala, H. P. Camp at Bilaspur

Reference No.	4/2001(RBT No. 199/04)
Instituted on	22-2-2001
Date of award	13-5-2005

Amar Singh s/o Shri Sihanu Ram, Village Fetti (Behal), P.O. Bhehal, Sub-Tehsil Naina Devi Ji, District Bilaspur
.. Petitioner.

Vs.

Divisional Forest Officer, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (H. P.)
.. Respondent.

"Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947."

For the petitioner: Shri S. S. Sippy, AR
For the respondent: Shri Roop Lal, AR

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate government for adjudication.

"Whether termination of services of Shri Amar Singh Ex-gardner, w. e. f. 1-7-1997 by the Divisional Forest Officer Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, H. P. without any notice, chargesheet, enquiry and without compliance of section 25 (F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on completion of 240 days continuous service as alleged is legal and justified. If not to what relief of consequential service benefits and the amount of compensation Shri Amar Singh is entitled ?"

2. The petitioner filed statement of claim averring that he was employed by the respondent on daily wages in Forest Range Swarghat, Behal Nursery on 1-3-1986 and he continued to work as such till 30-6-1997. Thereafter the respondent terminated the services of the petitioner on 1-7-1997 without any reason, charge sheet,

and notice verbally whereas the persons juniors to the petitioner were retained in service and are still working. The petitioner raised disputed before the labour department, thereafter the petitioner was re-engaged during the year 8/98 and he worked upto 11/98 but the wages for 8/98 to 11/98 have not been paid to the petitioner, which is an unfair labour practice. The petitioner left with no alternative but to serve the demand notice upon the management for illegal termination of the petitioner, hence this reference. The petitioner further alleged that he has put more than 240 days of continuous service in each completed year, as such termination of the services of the petitioner by the respondent w. e. f. 1-7-1997 is illegal and against the mandatory provisions of section 25 F (a) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the ACT). Since the petitioner's services were terminated and the persons junior to the petitioner are still working, therefore the petitioner's termination is illegal as well as in violation of section 25 G of the Act. The petitioner has prayed for his reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service.

2. The respondent resisted and contested the claim of the petitioner by filing reply wherein the respondent raised preliminary objections that the petition is not maintainable. On merits, the respondent alleged that there is no record showing that the petitioner had been working with the respondent since 1-3-1986, however, the petitioner was engaged on work w. e. f. 1988 and he worked only 30 days during the year. The respondent denied that the persons juniors to the petitioner are still working. The respondent alleged that the petitioner did not come on work after 30-6-1997 the question of giving payment to the petitioner does not arise. The petitioner did not complete 240 days in any of the year as shown in the mandays chart annexure R-1. The respondent alleged that the respondent has not violated the provisions of section 25 F (a) of the Act, nor section 25 G of the Act. The respondent alleged that the daily wages were engaged or dis-engaged as per the requirement of work and it is not the question of securing employment, then the question of violation of provisions of section 25 H of the Act, does not arise. The respondent has prayed for dismissal of the petition with costs.

3. The petitioner filed rejoinder wherein the petitioner re-affirmed and reiterated the averments made in the petition and denied the assertions of the respondent made in the reply. On the respective assertions of the parties, the following issues were framed by the court on 24-3-2004.

1. Whether the termination of the service of Shri Amar Singh, petitioner by the respondent is in violation of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as alleged? OPR
2. If issue No. 1 is proved in affirmative, whether the petitioner is entitled to any consequential benefits and compensation? OPR.
3. Whether the petition is not maintainable? OPR.
4. Relief.

4. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my issuewise findings are as under:

Issue No. 1	Yes.
Issue No. 2	decided accordingly
Issue No. 3	No

Relief The petition is allowed as per operative part of the award

(REASONS FOR FINDINGS)

Issues No. 1 and 2

5. Both these issues being interconnected and interlinked as such they are taken as such they are taken up together for discussion and decision

6. In order to prove both these issues, the petitioner Amar Singh filed his affidavit Ex. PW1/A as RW1 wherein he has stated that he was employed by the respondents daily wages basis in forest Range Swarghat, Nursery w. e. f. 1-3-1986 and he continued to work as such till 30-6-1997. His services were terminated by the respondent w. e. f. 1-7-1997, without any reason, charge sheet, inquiry verbally but other workers juniors to him namely S/Shri Ravinder Kumar, Hriday Raj, Biru Ram Hansi Ram etc were retained and they are still working. He further stated that he had put in more than 240 days continuous service in each completed year of service and his mandays chart is duly attested by the Range Officer, which is placed on the record. His services were terminated w. e. f. 1-7-1997 in an illegal and unjustified manner in violation of section 25-F of the Act, and also in violation of the principle laid down in section 25-G of the Act, 'Last come, first go'. The respondent after the disengagement of the petitioner also recruited new hands in place of the petitioner, without affording any opportunity to the petitioner for re-employment in provisions of section 25-H of the Act. The petitioner also stated that since he was dis-engaged by the respondent he is un-employed and his termination is bad in law as neither he was served any notice nor paid retrenchment compensation, therefore, he is entitled for full back wages.

7. The respondent was afforded an opportunity to cross-examine the petitioner but the respondent did not cross-examine the petitioner despite the opportunity was given to him to cross-examine him

8. The respondent examined one Shri Garja Ram, Deputy Ranger Block Swarghat, District Bilaspur as RW1 on behalf of the respondent, and respondent/ DFO Bilaspur did not appear in the witness box. Shri Garja Ram, while appearing as RW1 has stated that the petitioner had not completed 240 working days during the period he remained working. He was engaged in the nursery as seasonal workman and he was engaged for a period of one month and thereafter he dis-engaged for one month. The workman who has completed 240 working days, their seniority was maintained. The respondent has also brought on the record mandays chart of the petitioner Ex. RX. In the opening line of his cross-examination he admitted that Amar Singh petitioner is known to him and it is correct that Ex R-2 (yearwise detail of mandays chart of the petitioner) was issued from the department and he confirmed Ex. R-2. He also admitted that notice was not served upon the petitioner at the time when he was dis-engaged nor he was paid any retrenchment compensation

9. It appears from the mandays chart Ex. R-2 correctness of which is not denied by the RW1 Garja Ram, and it was issued by Range Officer, Swarghat, according to which the petitioner remained working from March, 1986 continuously till June, 1997, and during each year including the year 1986 to 1996 the petitioner has been shown as worked for more than 240 days in each calendar year and during the year 1997 he completed 161 days. The mandays chart Ex. R-2 appears to have been issued by Range Forest Officer, Swarghat Forest Division, Bilaspur. He also verified it to be correct in accordance with Range Officer, Swarghat, the correctness of which is not disputed by Garja Ram (RW1) as he has stated in his cross-examination that Ex. R-2 was issued from the department and he confirmed the same. Garja Ram has brought on the record Mandays Chart Ex. R1, which is neither verified nor the person who prepared it has stepped into the witness box to confirm its correctness as per the record where the petitioner continued to work as daily waged worker. It appears from the mandays chart Ex. R-1 that monthwise bifurcation of working days of the petitioner is not mentioned, therefore, it is difficult to conclude as to how many days the petitioner continued to work in the last 12 preceding months before he was dis-engaged from the service, as Ex. R-1 only reveals that the petitioner worked for 212 days in 1996 and 11 days in 1997. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was dis-engaged w. e. f. 1-7-1997 and he worked

only for first six months of 1997. Whereas mandays chart 'E R 1' correctness of which is not disputed by PW 1 and it is duly verified with a certificate that the position shown in 'E R 2' with regard to the mandays of the petitioner is correct in accordance with Range Office, Sonbhadra. It appears to be more authenticated as compared to mandays chart 'E R 1'. The respondent has not brought the original muster rolls of the petitioner to prove that in fact the position as shown in mandays chart 'E R 1' is correct and the position shown in mandays chart 'E R 2' is wrong.

(ii) After taking into consideration the statement of the petitioner/affidavit 'E PW 1 A' he has brought on record as PW 1 and fact that the respondent has not cross examined the petitioner, and so far that Charge Ram PW 1 accepted the correctness of mandays chart 'E R 2'. It appears that the petitioner worked for about 124 days from July, 1996 till June, 1997 i.e. 13 proceeding months before the petitioner was disengaged on 6/7/1997. Accordingly the petitioner has completed one year continuous service as defined under section 25 B of the Act, and accordingly the petitioner is undoubtedly entitled for award as provided under section 25 F of the Act which remains under.

Conditions precedent for retrenchment of workman

- the workman has been given one month's in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice is expired or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice; wages for the period of the notice;
- the workman has been paid at the time of retrenchment compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay (for every completed year of continuous service) or any part thereof in excess of six months; and
- notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the official gazette.)

11. It is stated by the petitioner in his affidavit 'E PW 1 A' that at the time he was disengaged, he was not served with any notice nor he was paid retrenchment compensation and this fact has been admitted by Charge Ram (RW 1) in his cross examination. In his cross examination he admitted that the petitioner was not served with any notice nor any compensation was paid to him. Under these circumstances, it can safely be concluded that services of the petitioner were disengaged by the respondent in violation of the mandatory requirement of section 25 F (a) and (b) of the Act. The conditions enumerated in section 25 F are conditions precedent for retrenchment of a workman who has completed continuous service as defined under section 25 B of the Act; the provisions of section 25 F are bounded in mandatory form and non-compliance therewith has a result of rendering the order of retrenchment void, *ab initio* or *non est*. Therefore, the termination of the petitioner is illegal and unjustified. The petitioner has also stated in his affidavit 'E PW 1 A' that after his retrenchment, he is unemployed and he is entitled for his reinstatement with back wages, whereas the respondent has not cross examined the petitioner that the petitioner remained in any gainful employment after his illegal and unjustified disengagement. Under these circumstances, the petitioner is definitely entitled for not only for reinstatement but also for all consequential benefits including service.

12. Having regard to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is also entitled for back wages to the extent of 50% as it has held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case titled "Deep Chandra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh, and another" (2001 11 P. 112) as under:

When an employee had put in service for more than 240 days in each year for several years whether

his services can be put to an end to without following the procedure prescribed under section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act. If there has been violation thereof such an employee will have to be reinstated in his original service on the same terms and conditions in which he was working earlier. If this is the position of law as laid to understand as to how the High Court would have interfered with the award made by Labour Court. The Labour Court, therefore, rightly granted reinstatement with back wages and other consequential benefits."

13. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as has been discussed above, as well as the position of law, I am of the considered view that the petitioner under the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case is not only entitled for his reinstatement but also other service benefits. Issues No 1 and 2 are decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

Issue No. 3:

14. The respondent has failed to lead any cogent and convincing evidence to show that the petitioner has not completed the required number of working days and therefore, the provisions of section 25 F of the Act are not attracted, as such the petition is not maintainable. Accordingly, keeping in view my findings on Issue No. 1 and 2 above, this issue is also decided against the respondent and in favour of the petitioner.

RELIEF

15. In view of my findings on issue No. 1 and 2 above, the petitioner is entitled for his reinstatement in his original service on the same terms and conditions in which he was working earlier. As consequence the petitioner is also entitled for back wages to the extent of 50% with all consequential service benefits including seniority. The respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner within a period of 90 days from the date of announcement of this award failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full back wages after the lapse of period of 90 days as referred to above. The reference is answered accordingly.

16. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after completion be consigned to record room.

Announced
13.5.2005

Seal

GEORGE,
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court cum Industrial Tribunal,
Dharamshala (H.P.)

Certified copy of Award Passed Shri George, Presiding Judge, Labour Court cum Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala (H.P.)

Reference No. 117/2001 (RII No. 149/04)
Instituted on 26.12.2001
Decided on 6.6.2005

Shri Punjab Singh, Patal son of Shri Dharam Ram Patal, P.O. Village & P.O. Dahan, Taluk Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh. Petitioner

VS

M/s The Teh-1 Palampur Co-operative Marketing and Consumer Society Ltd., Mandla through its Manager, Taluk Palampur, District Kangra. Respondent

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner Shri Vishal Singh, Vice counsel
For the respondent Shri Ajay Shrivastava, Adv

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate Government

"Whether the termination of the services of Workmen Shri Punjab Singh Patal w/o Ishai Parn Patal by the Management of the Ishai Patalam Cooperative Marketing & Consumer Society Ltd. Maranda, Ishai Patalam w.e.f. 11.01.2000 without complying with the section 25 F of the I.D. Act, 1947 is legal and just? If not what relief of services benefits the above Workmen is to be granted?"

7. On notice, the petitioner Punjab Singh Patal filed his statement of claim wherein he pleaded that he joined the respondent w.e.f. August 1990 as a Conductor and he was appointed on daily wages as such at Maranda. The petitioner further pleaded that since 1990 he was serving with the respondent society with utmost singleness and that on 11.10.2000 he received letter to the effect that his services were no longer required by the society. No reasons has been assigned as to why his services are not required especially when the society is not closing its venture. The petitioner averred that he has completed 240 days in the previous calendar year and the respondent had terminated his services without complying mandatory requirements of law as the respondent has not served him with the notice as required under section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to short as the Act) and as such the reference has been made by the Labour Commissioner. The petitioner averred that no compliance of any provision of the Act has been done by the respondent and thus, his termination is totally arbitrary, discriminatory, illegal in violation of provisions of Act in general and section 25 in particular and thus void *ab initio* and his retrenchment is bad as the respondent is now engaging some other person to perform the duties. The petitioner further averred that the respondent has retained juniors and after his retrenchment he has not been any where gainfully employed. The petitioner therefore, prayed that the petition may kindly be allowed and he may kindly be ordered to be reinstated as a Conductor by revoking the illegal order of his termination dated 11.01.2000 with full back wages with interest and consequential benefits.

8. The respondent contested the claim petition filed by the petitioner and filed written reply wherein raised the preliminary objections that the petition as filed is neither competent nor maintainable before this Hon'ble Court, the petitioner is not entitled to invoke jurisdiction as vested in this Hon'ble Court specially in view of section 92 of the Act, which bars the jurisdiction of the court and in the matter, if petitioner has got some dispute with respect to his engagement/discontinuation, the same can only be adjudicated as per the provisions of the Act and thus, the present petition as filed is liable to be rejected. The respondent further raised the preliminary objection that the petitioner above stated has filed O.A. No. 2654 of 2001 titled as Manoj Dixit and others Versus State of H.P. and others, which has been filed on 16.9.2001, whereas the petitioner appears to have been filed somewhere in the year 2002, the O.A. earlier in point of time praying the same relief. The petitioner as filed now is not maintainable and thus, the petitioner is estopped by his act, conduct and acquiescence and jurisdiction of two courts cannot be invoked.

9. On merits, the respondent denied all other assertions made by the petitioner in his statement of claim. The respondent further averred that in view of the work which once assigned for which the services of the petitioner were engaged, having ceased in view of the policy of the State of Himachal Pradesh thereby taking a policy decision not to sell a few items through Society, no other course left except to disengage the services of the employees who got rendered surplus. The respondents pleaded that the petitioner not being workman respondent being not industry, provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act cannot be enlisted and therefore,

the petitioner filed is not maintainable. The respondent prayed that the petitioner may be dismissed.

10. The petitioner filed rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent wherein he re-affirmed and reiterated the assertions made by him in this statement of claim and denied all the findings made by the respondent in their reply.

11. On the respective assertions of the parties following issues were framed for decision on 5.11.2004

1. Whether the termination of services of the petitioner w.e.f. 11.10.2000 by the respondent is in violation of the provisions of section 25 (F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and therefore, void and unsustainable, as alleged? (Y/N)
2. If issue No. 1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief the petitioner is entitled to along with the services benefits? (Y/N)
3. Relief

12. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my issues wise findings are as under

Issue No. 1	Yes
Issue No. 2	As per operative part of Award
Relief	The petition is allowed as per operative part of the Award

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1 and 2

13. Both the issues are inter connected and hence taken together for discussions and findings.

14. The petitioner Punjab Singh appeared as PW1 and he stated that he joined the services of the respondent w.e.f. August 1990 as daily wage conductor and his services were regularised in the year 1991 as conductor with the respondent. His services were dispensed with by the respondent vide letter EX PW1/A without assigning any reason. He completed more than 240 days in each calendar year. His services were terminated without compliance of mandatory requirements of law. The respondent have not served any notice as required under section 25 (F) of the Act. The engagement of the petitioner is arbitrary and illegal and as such he is entitled for his re-engagement from the date of his termination. He had not worked anywhere from the date of his termination. He had not worked anywhere from the date of his disengagement in any gainful employment. The respondent has engaged some junior persons and they are still in service. The petitioner was engaged in an illegal and arbitrary manner vide order EX PW1/A w.e.f. 11.10.2000 which is required to be declared as null and void.

15. In his cross-examination, he was put to the suggestion that the respondent is a registered society and have its own by-laws which he admitted as correct. He also admitted that he alongwith other workers filed a petition before the Administrative Tribunal which was later on dismissed as withdrawn. He was also put to the suggestion that he was engaged as daily wages purely temporary basis to which he replied in the negative. He himself stated that he was engaged as conductor and his services were regularised. However, he had shown his ignorance that the State Government has withdrawn the work that is public distribution functions and other distribution and marketing work from the respondent that and due to the transfer of this work the employees worked with the respondent became surplus. However, he denied that he also became surplus employee. He was also put to the suggestion by the respondent in his cross-examination that he had abandoned the work at

his own to which he replied in the negative. However, he denied that his services were not disengaged in an illegal manner.

11. To controvert the evidence of the petitioner the respondent examined one Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager of the society who appeared as RW1 and stated that the petitioner alongwith other employees who were working with the respondent filed an OA before the State Administrative Tribunal in the same case. He also stated that in year 2000 the State Government has withdrawn the P. D. S. and fertilisers distribution work as a policy decision from the respondent society and the respondent society was directed not to sell these articles through the society and therefore, the respondent society left with no source of other work and therefore, the employees of the society became surplus and the Board of Directors of the respondent society left with no chance except to dis-engage the petitioner.

12. In his cross examination, he admitted that the applicant worked as conductor w.e.f. August 1990 till 31-10-2000 as daily wager with the respondent society. Though he tried to clarify that the petitioner worked as workman and according to him workman means a person who works. He also admitted that the applicant worked for more than 240 days in each calendar year with the respondent society and no reasons has been as to why the applicant's services were dis-engaged. He also replied in the negative that the respondent has not employed junior person to the petitioner after his disengagement. He admitted that Shri Bir Bahadur is still working with the respondent as Part Time worker, who is junior to the petitioner. He also admitted that no notice under section 25 (F) of the Act was even issued to the applicant. However, he denied that the petitioner was not illegally disengaged.

13. The stand taken by the petitioner as is emerging from the evidence of the parties as referred to herein above, is that the petitioner who was working as a conductor with the respondent society and worked as from August 1990 till 31-10-2000, his services were dis-engaged by the respondent in violation of the mandatory requirements of Section 25-F of the Act and that after the removal/dis-engagement of the petitioner his juniors were engaged and they are still working. These facts are not disputed in the cross-examination by Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, the only witness examined by the respondent to controvert the claim of the petitioner.

14. Whereas the claim of the respondent as is emerging from the stand taken by the respondent in reply and also the facts stated in the examination in chief and the facts admitted in his cross examination, it appears that the respondent is not denying the fact that the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged without any notice etc. as required under section 25-F of the Act, rather the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged for the reasons that the state Government as a policy decision has withdrawn the P. D. S. and fertiliser work from the respondent society and as such the respondent society left with no work to engage the petitioner, other employees and therefore, the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged.

15. Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, has taken another stand while appearing as RW1 on behalf of the respondent that in fact the services of the petitioner were not dis-engaged, rather the petitioner left the job at his own as in the cross examination of the petitioner, he was put to the suggestion that he himself abandoned the work at his own to which he had replied in the negative.

16. From the evidence of the parties there remains no doubt that the petitioner remained working with the respondent and discharged duties of a conductor from August 1990 till the date of his disengagement i.e. 31-10-2000 and a conductor is a workman within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the Act, as it has been held by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled "Management of Roneo Vickers India Ltd. Vs. Lt. Governor

of Delhi", 1994 LLR 253 (Delhi). As per the statement of the petitioner and the facts admitted by Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager, RW1 of the respondent Society that the services of the petitioner were not dispensed with after following the procedure as laid down under section 25-F of the act.

17. It has been stated by the petitioner while appearing as RW1 that he worked for 240 days in calendar year of his service and this is not disputed in his cross examination by the respondent. Rather Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, has admitted this fact in his cross examination and therefore, the petitioner is held to have continuous service on his credit as per the provisions of Section 25-B of the Act and automatically being a workman the petitioner is entitled for all the protections as provided under section 25-F of the Act, which reads as under :—

"25—F Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workman :—

No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until :—

- (a) The workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice ;
- (b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen day's average pay (for every completed year of continuous service) of any part thereof in excess of six months; and
- (c) Notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the official gazette ."

18. The conditions enumerated in section 25-F are the conditions precedent and the provision of section 25-F are couched in mandatory form and non-compliance there with as a result of rendering the order of retrenchment void, *ab initio* or *non est* (State of Rajasthan Vs. Miss Usha Lokwani, 1994 LLR 369 (Raj.). In case titled "Auro Engg. Pvt. Ltd. Vs. R. A. Gadekar", 1992 (1) LLJ 693, Mr. Justice B. N. Srikrishna has explained the consequences of non-compliance of section 25-F of the Act as under :—

"It is settled law that section 25-F of the Act was introduced into the statute book by Parliament as a measure of amelioration. The section is specifically intended to soften the blow of unemployment which would fall upon a workman, who is suddenly deprived of his source livelihood. Considering the constraining and the economy of the country as a whole and that of the industrial units, Parliament has limited this amelioration to what is specifically provided in Clauses (a) and (b) of Section 25-F viz. payment of one month's wages in lieu of notice and retrenchment compensation calculated in accordance with clause (b) of section 25-F, the section imposes as mandatory duty on the employer which is a condition precedent to retrenchment of workman. Consequently contravention thereof, however, slight vitiates the act of retrenchment itself. When a statute mandated a duty as a condition precedent for affecting retrenchment, there is no difficulty in holding that breach of the said condition invalidated the retrenchment and renders it void *ab initio*."

19. And therefore, the termination of the petitioner by the respondent for the reason that the respondent was left with no work due to the change of policy decision by the State Government, has known the consequences for the reason that before dis-engaging the petitioner the respondent was required to follow the mandatory procedure laid down under section 25-F (a), (b) and (c) of the Act. Apparently, from the facts, circumstances and the evidence of the parties, as has been discussed hereinabove, the respondent while dis-engaging the services of the petitioner from his service as a conductor of the respondent society, has not followed the mandatory provisions laid down under section 25-F (a), (b), (c) of the Act and therefore, the termination of the petitioner is improper, unjustified and illegal.

20. Consequently, it is claimed by the petitioner while appearing as RWI that though his services were dis-engaged by the respondent, but his juniors were retained in service in violation of the mandatory requirements of section 25-G of the Act.

21. Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager of the respondent society while appearing as RWI has admitted in his cross examination that the respondent has employed juniors to the applicant after his dis-engagement and Shri Bir Bahadur is still working with the respondent society. He also admitted that Shri Bir Bahadur is junior to the petitioner.

22. In view of the facts as referred to herein above admitted by Shri Rameshwar Singh, RWI, in his cross examination the dis-engagement of the petitioner also appears to be in violation of the principle of last come first go, enunciated under section 25-G of the Act. It has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled "Deep Chandra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another", 2001 LLR 312, that in case the services of the workman is terminated in violation of the mandatory requirements of section 25-F of the Act, the workman is entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions. In the present case the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is as under :—

"When an employee had put in service for more than 240 days in each calendar year for several years whether his services can be put to an end to without following the procedure prescribed under section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. If there has been violation thereof such and employee will have to be re-instated in his original service on the same terms and conditions in which he was working earlier. If this is the position of law, we fail to understand as to how the High Court would have interfered with the award made by the Labour Court. The Labour Court therefore, rightly granted re-instatement with back wages and other consequential benefits".

23. In the present case the petitioner while appearing as PWI has specifically stated that after his disengagement he is un-employed and that he has no work in government or private sector in any gainful employment. Whereas, the respondent had led no evidence on the record that the petitioner remained in any gainful employment after his dis-engagement. The respondent has also led no evidence on the record to show that the petitioner was at fault on account of any reason resulted in his dis-engagement and keeping in view the entire facts, circumstances and evidence on the record, the petitioner is not only entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal, improper and unjustified dis-engagement and therefore, he is also entitled for all consequential service benefits including back wages to the extent of 50%.

24. From the evidence of the respondent also from the cross-examination of the petitioner nothing has come on the record to show that the petitioner was at fault due to any reason for his dis-engagement and therefore, in the

peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner is entitled for lump sum amount of Rs. 2,000/- as litigation expenses. Accordingly, both the issues are decided in favour of the applicant/petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

25. In view of my findings on above issues since the termination of the petitioner is illegal and unsustainable and therefore, the petitioner is held to be entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal termination. The petitioner is also entitled for all consequential service benefits including back wages to the extent of 50%. The petitioner shall also be entitled for a lump sum amount of Rs. 2,000/- as litigation expenses. The respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner within the period of 90 days from the date of announcement of this award failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full wages. The reference is answered accordingly.

26. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. The file after completion be consigned to the Record-Room.

Announced.

Seal.

GEORGE
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Dharamshala, (H.P.).

Certified copy of Award Passed by Shri George, Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, H. P. (Camp at Chamba)

Reference No.	.. 40/2002 (RBT No. 241/04)
Instituted on	.. 4-2-2002
Decided on	.. 21-5-2005

Shri Mukesh Kumar s/o Shri Baldev Ram, r/o village Diyoga, P. O. Salooni, District Chamba, H. P. ... Petitioner.

Vs.

The Executive Engineer, H. P. P. W. D. Division Salooni, District Chamba, H. P. ... Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner .. Shri T. R. Bhardwaj, AR

For the respondent .. Shri P. C. Malhotra, AE, AR

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate Government :—

"Whether the verbal termination w. e. f. 2-9-95 of Shri Mukesh Kumar s/o Shri Baldev Ram daily wage Beldar by the Executive Engineer, H. P. P. W. D. Division Salooni, District Chamba and practice of giving intermittent breaks during the period 1-7-1995 to 2-9-95 is legal and justified? If not, to what seniority, service benefit and relief the concerned workman is entitled to."

2. On notice, the petitioner Mukesh Kumar filed his statement of claim wherein he pleaded that he was engaged by the respondent as beldar on daily wages basis from 7/1995 and he worked as such with the respondent with sincerity, honesty and to the entire satisfaction of the respondent. The petitioner further pleaded that he was given illegal intermittent breaks in his service tenure as

beldar by the respondent from 12/1995 to 2/1999 and he was verbally terminated by the respondent in 2/1999 without assigning any reason and without giving any opportunity of being heard and since then he is unemployed. The petitioner averred that by giving him intermittent breaks in his service by the respondent, he could not complete 240 days in any calendar year of his service tenure and therefore, he has been deprived of the protection of provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) and regularisation as per the policy framed by the State Government and thus, his termination is illegal and without any ground. The petitioner further averred that the policy of last come first go has not been followed by the respondent which is against provisions of section 25-G of the Act, as the persons junior to him are still in service of the respondent. The petitioner averred that the intermittent breaks in his service were given just to benefit the junior workmen and hence the act of the respondent is arbitrary, unconstitutional and unjustified and against the public policy. The petitioner claimed that if his services had not been terminated and had not given illegal intermittent breaks, he would have completed 240 days in every calendar year. The petitioner prayed that the intermittent breaks given in his service by the respondent may be ordered to be added in the service tenure and he may be ordered to be re-instated in the service as Beldar with the respondent from the date of his illegal termination i.e. 2/99 with full back wages, seniority and other consequential benefits.

3. The respondent contested the claim petition filed by the petitioner and filed written reply wherein raised the preliminary objections that the present petition of the applicant is not maintainable as no legal or fundamental right of the applicant has ever been infringed in any manner, the applicant has never completed the criteria of 240 days in any of calendar year i.e. from 1995 to 2001, his services were never terminated/retrenched during 2/99 but he left the job at his own accord. He was habitual and remained absent from duty willfully and hence the question of illegal termination of the petitioner during 2/99 is totally false, baseless and away from the truth.

4. On merits, the respondent denied all other assertions made by the petitioner in his statement of claim and averred that the services of the petitioner were never terminated by the respondent during 2/99, but he had left the job at his own accord and no intermittent breaks were given to the applicant. The applicant has never completed the criteria of 240 days in any year from 1995 to 2001 as such there was no need to serve notice under Section 25-F of the Act and thus, the plea of the applicant is totally wrong and therefore, the respondent prayed for the dismissal of the claim petition.

5. The petitioner filed rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent where in he reiterated and re-affirmed the pleadings made by him in his statement of claim and denied all other assertions made by the respondent in the reply.

6. On the respective assertions of the parties following issues were framed for decision on 26-5-2004 :-

1. Whether the action of termination of petitioner by respondent by giving breaks without complying the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified? OPR
2. Whether there is violation of provisions of section 25-F and 25-G of I.D. Act, 1947? OPR
3. If issue No. 1 is not proved, to what relief of service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? OPR
4. Whether the petition is not maintainable as alleged in preliminary objections No. 1? OPR
5. Relief

7. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my issue wise findings are as under :

Issue No. 1	..	No
Issue No. 2	..	Yes
Issue No. 3	..	Yes
Issue No. 4	..	No
Relief	..	The petition is allowed as per operative part of the Award

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1, 2 and 3.

8. All the three issues are inter-connected and hence taken together for discussions and findings.

9. The petitioner Mukesh Kumar appeared as PW1 and he stated that he was engaged as daily waged beldar by the respondent in July, 1995 and he worked as such till February, 1999. In February, 1999 his services were dispensed with by the respondent without serving any notice and payment of retrenchment compensation. The respondent used to give him artificial breaks during the aforesaid period so that the petitioner may not be able to complete 240 working days of service in each calendar year. His services were terminated by the respondent in an illegal and unjustified manner. Though he was disengaged, but his juniors were retained and they are still working with the respondent namely Dharmender, Suresh Kumar etc. The petitioner kept on requesting the respondent for his re-instatement and also for not giving him artificial breaks in his service, but of no avail. He also sent a written representation Ex. P.A. He also stated that after his dis-engagement w.e.f. February, 1999 he is un-employed and therefore, the entire period of his artificial breaks during the service may be treated on duty and he may be re-instated with full back wages and other consequential benefits.

10. In his cross-examination, he was put to the suggestion that he did not voluntarily join his duty, to which he replied in the negative, rather he stated that he was not allowed to complete 240 days by the respondent. He admitted that he moved the Administrative Tribunal for his illegal dis-engagement.

11. The respondent in order to controvert the evidence of the petitioner examined Shri P. C. Matholia, Assistant Engineer, as RW1, who has stated that the petitioner was engaged as daily wage beldar w.e.f. July, 1995 to January 2001. The petitioner has not completed 240 days during this period in any year. He has also brought on the record the mandays chart of the petitioner Ex. RW1/A. He also stated that the petitioner used to remain willfully absent and after 2001 the petitioner left the job and he did not turn up. The petitioner was not dis-engaged by the respondent at any point of time.

12. In his cross-examination he admitted that the respondent has not produced the original muster rolls for the period February and March, 1999, in which the name of the petitioner has not been enrolled. He admitted that after conciliation proceedings the petitioner was again engaged and dis engaged. However, he tried to state at his own that the petitioner left the job at his own. He admitted that the original muster rolls he has not brought in evidence on the basis of which the mandays chart Ex. RW1/A was prepared. He also admitted that the name of the applicant has not been enrolled in the muster rolls during the months mentioned in the Ex. RW1/A as blank. The respondent never called any explanation of the petitioner for his willful absence. However, he denied that the petitioner was retrenched, but he admitted that no explanation of the petitioner was called at any point of time. He admitted that no notice has been given to the petitioner, nor any retrenchment compensation was paid nor the permission of the appro-

private Government was obtained. He also admitted that no charge sheet has been served upon the petitioner nor any enquiry has held, nor any opportunity of being heard in person allowed to the petitioner. In the last lines of his cross-examination, he admitted that Shri Dharmender, Suresh etc. are working with the respondent and their date of engagement is October, 1995 and March, 1996 respectively. He also admitted that the respondent has no written proof that the petitioner has left the job of his own.

13. The claim of the petitioner as is emerging from his statement as PW1 is that he was engaged a daily wage by the respondent in July, 1995 and he worked as such till February, 1999 when his services were dis-engaged and also that during this period he was given artificial breaks so that he may not be able to complete 240 days of service in each calendar year of his service. This fact is not contradicted by the cross-examination of the petitioner as PW1.

14. The next claim of the petitioner is that despite the fact that he was dis-engaged by the respondent in an illegal manner without any notice and payment of compensation, but his juniors were retained and they continued to work with the respondent namely Dharmender, Suresh and others. This fact is also not contradicted by the respondent in the cross-examination of the petitioner as PW1. Rather Shri P. C. Matlotia, Assistant Engineer, who appeared as RW1 has admitted in his cross-examination that the name of the petitioner was not enrolled in the muster rolls during the months mentioned/written blank in Annexure R-I, Ex. RW1/A (Mandays chart) which clearly reveals that it was not the fault of the petitioner for not enrolling his name in the muster rolls during the months mentioned/written blank in Mandays chart Ex. RW1/A.

15. It is a settled and established position of law that any artificial breaks if given by an employer in order to defeat the provisions of welfare enactment which amounts to unfair labour practice and a tactics defeat to the mandatory provisions of law.

16. It is also well settled that the period of cessation work or any artificial breaks given in the service of an employee not due to any fault on the part of the employee always gets calculated as a period of continuous service as defined under section 25-B of the Act. Section 25-B of the Act reads as under :-

"25-B. Definition of continuous service.--For the purpose of this Chapter :-

- (1) A workman shall be said to be in continuous service for a period if he, is for that period, in uninterrupted service, including service which may be interrupted on account of sickness or authorised leave or an accident or a strike which is not legal, or a lock-out or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman ;
- (2) where workman is not in continuous service within the meaning of clause (1) for a period of one year or six months, he shall be deemed to be in continuous service under an employer ;
- (3) for a period of one year, if the workman, during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than :
 - (i) one hundred and ninety days in the case of workman employed below ground in a mine; and
 - (ii) two hundred and forty days, in any other case ; "

17. The words "Cessation of work" which is not due to any fault on the part of a workman envisaged by the legislature in sub-section 1 of Section 25-B of the

Act, makes it clear that the cessation of work which is not due to any fault of the workman is to be included for calculating the continuous service of one year as defined under section 25 B of the Act.

18. It appears from the mandays chart Ex. RW1/A that in the last preceding 12 months i.e. before a February 1999, the month in which the services of the petitioner were disengaged by the respondent, the period from March, 1998 till January, 1999, the total number of working days of the petitioner comes to 216 1/2 and if the period of May, 1998, August, 1998 and December, 1998 is taken into account as working days of the petitioner, because the name of the petitioner was not enrolled by the respondent during these three months without any fault on the part of the petitioner are therefore, are liable to be calculated in the period of continuous service that means the total number of working days of the petitioner comes to 216-1/2 plus 93 days, total 309-1/2 days (counting 31 days each for May, August and December, 1998).

19. It is also well established and settled position of law that in computation of period under sub-section (2) of section 25 B of the Act, Sundays and holidays should be taken into account (G. Yudi Reddy V Brook Bond India Ltd., 1994 L.R. 328 (AP) (DB), thus approximately during the period March, 1998 till January, 1999 all Sundays and national holidays if counted towards the working days of the petitioner, that comes not less than 52 days and if this period is taken half of the mark atleast 26 days are required to be counted and thus, having regard to the totality of the working days in the light of the evidence and the position of law as has been discussed herein above, the petitioner has completed 216-1/2+93+26, which comes to 335-1/2 working days and therefore, the petitioner is deemed to be in continuous service for period of one year as per the requirement of section 25-B of the Act. Even if for arguments sake the period of 93 days i.e. May, August and December, 1998 are not counted, even then the petitioner appears to have completed more than 240 working days i.e. 215-1/2+26 total 242-1/2 working days, in the last preceding twelve months i.e. March, 1998 to January, 1999.

20. The contention raised on behalf of the respondent that the petitioner has failed to completed 240 working days in each calendar year and therefore, he is not entitled for the protection of mandatory requirements of Section 25-F of the Act, appears to be totally mis-conceived and unsound. Since the petitioner has completed more than 240 working days during the period of 12 calendar months preceding the date of his termination as has been discussed in details herein above, and therefore, the petitioner is entitled for all the safeguards provided under section 25-F of the Act. Section 25 F of the Act reads as under :-

"25-F. Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen :-

No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until :-

- (a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice ;
- (b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay (for every completed year of continuous service) or any part thereof in excess of six months, and
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official gazette) "

21. The petitioner while appearing as PW1 has stated that at the time his services were retrenched in February, 1999, he was not served with any notice nor paid any retrenchment compensation, nor the permission of the appropriate Government was sought. This fact has been admitted by Shri P. C. Matlotia, Assistant Engineer, RW1, in his cross-examination. The conditions enumerated in section 25-F clause a, b and c are conditions precedent and are couched in mandatory form and non-compliance therewith has the result of rendering the order of retrenchment void, *ab initio* or *non est* (State of Rajasthan Vs. Miss Usha Lekhani, 1994 LLR 369 (Raj.)).

22. Since the respondent has not complied with any of the mandatory conditions laid down under Section 25-F (a), (b) and (c) of the Act, while disengaging the service of the petitioner and therefore, the dis-engagement of the petitioner is unjustified, illegal void and is liable to be set aside.

23. The next contention of the petitioner is that his services were dis-engaged in February, 1999, however, his juniors namely Dharminder, Suresh and others were retained in service and this aspect of the version given by the petitioner has not been contradicted by the respondent in the cross-examination of the petitioner, rather Shri P. C. Matlotia, RW1, in his cross-examination admitted that the persons namely Dharminder and Suresh are still working with the respondent and their date of engagement is October, 1995 and March, 1996 respectively. Whereas the mandays chart Ex. RW1/A brought on the record by the respondent reveals that the petitioner was engaged in July, 1995 and therefore, there is no doubt left that the petitioner is definitely senior to both these workmen namely Dharminder and Suresh and the dis-engagement of the petitioner is therefore, is violative of section 25-G of the Act. Section 25-G of the Act reads as under :—

"25-G Procedure for retrenchment:—

Where any workman in an industrial establishment who is a citizen of India, is to be retrenched and he belongs to particular category of workmen in that establishment, in the absence of any agreement between the employer and the workman in this behalf, the employer shall ordinarily retrench the workman who was the last person to be employed in that category unless for reasons to be recorded the employer retrenches any other workman".

24. In view of the facts deposed by the petitioner as PW1 and which remains un-contradicted and the facts admitted by Shri P. C. Matlotia, RW1 as referred to herein above, the dis-engagement of the petitioner is violative of section 25-G of the Act.

25. The contention raised by the respondent that the petitioner left the job at his own after 2001 appears to be not relevant in the facts and circumstances of the present case for the reason that the reference has been received from the appropriate Government to this court for adjudication as to whether the termination of the petitioner *v. e. f.* February 1999 by the respondent is legal and justified. The respondent has led no evidence to prove that the petitioner abandoned the job at his own in February, 1999. Otherwise also abandonment of job without any intimation to the employer is a serious misconduct for which the workman is required to be proceeded against departmentally instead of dispensing with his services of removing his name from the muster roll automatically.

26. Shri P. C. Matlotia, while appearing as RW1, has admitted in his cross-examination that no notice was given, nor any compensation was paid, nor the petitioner at any point of time was served with any explanation for his absence, nor any enquiry was conducted. The petitioner was also not given an opportunity of being heard in person. All these facts have been admitted by Shri P. C. Matlotia, RW1, in his cross-

examination, which makes it clear beyond all doubts that the respondent has taken the plea of abandonment of job by the petitioner after thought, which has no relevance in the facts and circumstances of the present case. It has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled "Deep Chandra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another" 2001 LLR 312 that in case any workman is terminated in violation of the mandatory requirements of Section 25-F of the Act, the workman is required to be re-instated on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal termination.

27. The petitioner has claimed that he is unemployed on account of his illegal dis-engagement and the respondent has led no evidence on the record that after the dis-engagement of the petitioner, he is gainfully employed. Under these circumstances, the petitioner is definitely entitled not only for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal termination, but also for all consequential service benefits including seniority and back wages to the extent of 50%. Accordingly, all the three issues are decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

Issue No. 4:

28. In view of my findings on issue No. 1 to 3 above, the contention of the respondent that the petition is not maintainable appears to be totally mis-conceived. The petitioner has completed the required number of working days in the last twelve preceding months of his dis-engagement and therefore, the contention raised on behalf of the respondent is without any factual or legal force. Accordingly this issue is also decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

29. In view of my findings on above issues, since the dis-engagement of the petitioner by the respondent is held to be illegal and unjustified and therefore, the petitioner is entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal termination. The petitioner shall also be entitled for all consequential service benefits including seniority and back wages to the extent of 50%. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, since the petitioner has been put to un-warranted relentless litigation due to no fault on his part, he is also entitled for lump sum amount of Rs. 2000/- as litigation expenses. The respondent is directed to reengage the petitioner within a period of 90 days from the date of announcement of this Award failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full wages. The State Government, if feels it appropriate, may order proper enquiry and fix accountability on those Officer(s) who are responsible for this "relentless litigation" including the Officer(s) who had peremptorily terminated the petitioner. The reference is answered accordingly.

30. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced.

Seal. **GEORGE,**
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh.

Certified copy of Award dated 6-6-05 passed by Hon'ble Shri George, Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh

Reference No. : 88/2002 (RBT No. 151/04)
Instituted : 13-3-2002
Decided on : 6-6-2005

Kuldeep Kumar s/o Shri Jagdish Chand, V. P. O. Arla, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh
Petitioner.

Vs.

The Tehsil Palampur Co-operative Marketing and Consumer Society Ltd. Maranda, through its Manager

Tehsil Palampur District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.
.. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Shri Vishal Sood, Vice Counsel.
For the responseent : Shri Ajay Sharotari, Adv.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate government :—

“Whether the termination of the services of ex-daily waged Driver Shri Kuldeep Kumar s/o Shri Jagdish Chand, V. P. O. Arla, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh by the Management of the Tehsil Palampur Co-operative Marketing and Consumer Society Ltd. Maranda, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh w. e. f. 31-10-2000 without complying with the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified? If not, what service benefits and reliefs the above workman is entitled to?”

2. On notice, the petitioner Kuldeep Kumar filed his statement of claim wherein he pleaded that he joined the respondent w. e. f. 15-7-1998 as Driver and he was appointed on daily wages as such at Maranda. The petitioner further pleaded that since 1998 he was serving with the respondent society with utmost sincerity and that on 31-10-2000 he received a letter to the effect that his service were no longer required by the society. No reasons has been assigned as to why his services are not required especially when the society is not closing its venture. The petitioner averred that he has completed 240 days in the previous calendar year and the respondent had terminated his services without complying the mandatory requirements of law as the respondent has not served him with the notice as required under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (herein after referred in short as the Act) and as such, the reference has been made by the Labour Commissioner. The petitioner averred that no complinace of any provision of the Act has been done by the respondent and thus, his termination is totally arbitrary, discriminatory, illegal in violation of provisions of Act in general and Section 25-F particular and thus, void *ab initio* and his retrenchment is bad as the respondent is now engaging some other persons to perform the duties. The petitioner further averred that the respondent has retained his juniors and after his retrenchment he has been any where gainfully employed. The petitioner therefore, prayed that the petition may kindly be allowed and the petitioner may kindly be ordered to be re-instated as a Driver by revoking the illegal order of his termination dated 31-10-2000 with full back wages with interest and consequential benefits.

3. The respondent contested the claim petition filed by the petitioner and filed written reply wherein raised the preliminary objection that the petition as filed neither competent nor maintainable before this Hon'ble Court, the petitioner is not entitled to invoke the jurisdiction as vested in this Hon'ble Court specially in view of Section 92 of the Act, which bars the jurisdiction of the courts and in the matter, if petitioner has got some dispute with respect to his engagement discontinuation, the same can only be adjudicated as per the provisions of the Act and thus, the present petition as filed is liable to be rejected. The respondent further raised the preliminary objection that the petitioner above stated has filed OA No. 2654 of 2001 titled Manoj Dixit and others Versus State of Himachal Pradesh and others, which was filed on 16-9-2001, whereas, the petitioner appears to have been filed somewhere in the year 2002, the OA earlier in point of time praying the same reliefs, the petitioner as filed now is not maintainable and thus, the petitioner is estopped by his act, conduct and acquiescence and jurisdiction of two courts cannot be invoked.

4. On merits, the respondent denied all other assertions made by the petitioner in his statement of claim. The respondent further averred that in view of the work which once accrued for which the services of the petitioner were engaged, having ceased in view of the policy of the State of Himachal Pradesh thereby taking a policy decision not to sell a few items through Society, no other source was left except to dis-engage the services of the employees who get rendered surplus. The respondent pleaded that the petitioner not being workman, respondent being not industry provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act cannot be raised and therefore, the petition filed is not maintainable. The respondent prayed that the petition may be dismissed.

5. The petitioner filed rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent wherein he re-affirmed and reiterated the assertions made by him in his statement of claim and denied all the pleadings made by the respondent in their reply.

6. On the respective assertions of the parties following issues were framed for decision on 5-11-2004 :—

1. Whether the termination of services of the petitioner w. e. f. 31-10-2000 by the respondent is in violation of the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and therefore, void and unsustainable, as alleged ?

OPP.

2. If issue No. 1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief the petitioner is entitled to alongwith the service benefits ?

OPP.

3. Relief.

7. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my issue-wise findings are as under :—

Issue No. 1 .. Yes.

Issue No. 2 .. As per operative part of Award.

Relief .. The petition is allowed as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1 and 2 :

8. Both the issues are inter-connected and hence taken together for discussions and findings.

9. The petitioner Kuldeep Kumar appeared as PW1 and he stated that he joined the services of the respondent w. e. f. 15-7-1998 as Driver and was appointed on daily wages. His services were dispensed with by the respondent vide letter Ex. PW1/A without any reason. He served with the respondent with utmost sincerity and to the satisfaction of the respondent. He has completed 240 days in each calendar year. His services were terminated without compliance of mandatory requirements of law. The respondent have not served any notice as required under section 25-F of the Act. Dis-engagement of the petitioner is arbitrary and illegal and as such, he is entitled for his re-engagement from the date of his termination. He had not worked anywhere from the date of his dis-engagement in any gainful employment. The respondent has engaged some junior persons and they are still in service. The petitioner was dis-engaged in an illegal and arbitrary manner vide order Ex. PW1/A w. e. f. 31-10-2000 which is required to be declared as null and void.

10. In his cross-examination, he was put to the suggestion that the respondent is a registered society and have its own byelaws, which he admitted as correct. He also admitted that he alongwith other workers filed a petition before the Administrative Tribunal which was later on dismissed as withdrawn. He was also put to the suggestion that he was engaged as daily wage on purely temporary basis to which he replied in the nega-

live. He had shown his ignorance that the State Government has withdrawn the work that is, public distribution functions and other distribution and marketing work from the respondent that and due to the transfer of this work the employees worked with the respondent became surplus. However, he denied that he became surplus employee. He was also put to the suggestion by the respondent in his cross-examination that he had abandoned the work at his own to which he replied in the negative. However, he denied that his services were not dis-engaged in an illegal manner.

11. To controvert the evidence of the petitioner the respondent examined one Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager of the respondent society who appeared as RW1 and stated that the petitioner along with some other employees who were working with the respondent filed an OA before the State Administrative Tribunal in the same case. He also stated that in the year 2000 the State Government has withdrawn the P. D. S. and fertilizers distribution work as a policy decision from the respondent society, and the respondent society was directed not to sell these articles through the society and therefore, the respondent society left with no source of other work and therefore, the employees of the society became surplus and the Board of Directors of the respondent society left with no chance except to dis-engage the petitioner. He also stated that the applicant Kuldeep Kumar was earlier engaged as a Driver on daily rate purely on temporary basis.

12. In his cross-examination, he admitted that the applicant worked as Driver *i. e. f.* 1998 till 31-10-2000 as daily wage with the respondent society. Though he tried to clarify that the petitioner worked as workman and according to him workman means a person who works. He also admitted that the applicant worked for more than 240 days in each calendar year with the respondent society and no reason has been as to why the applicant's services were dis-engaged. He also replied in the negative that the respondent has not employed junior persons to the petitioner after his dis-engagement. He admitted that Shri Bir Bahadur is still working with the respondent as Part Time worker, who is junior to the petitioner. He also admitted that no notice under section 25-F of the Act was ever issued to the applicant. However, he denied that the petitioner was not illegally dis-engaged.

13. The stand taken by the petitioner, as is emerging from the evidence of the parties as referred to hereinabove, is that the petitioner who was working as a Driver with the respondent society and worked as such from 1998 till 31-10-2000, his services were dis-engaged by the respondent in violation of the mandatory requirements of section 25-F of the Act and that after the removal/dis-engagement of the petitioner his juniors were engaged and they are still working. These facts are not disputed in the cross-examination by Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, the only witness examined by the respondent to controvert the claim of the petitioner.

14. Whereas the claim of the respondent, as is emerging from the stand taken by the respondent in reply and also the facts stated in the examination in chief and the facts admitted in his cross-examination, it appears that the respondent is not denying the fact that the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged without any notice etc. as required under section 25-F of the Act, rather the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged for the reason that the State Government as a policy decision has withdrawn the P. D. S. and fertiliser work from the respondent society and as such, the respondent society left with no work to engage the petitioner and other employees and therefore, the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged.

15. Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, has taken another stand while appearing as RW1 on behalf of the respondent that in fact the services of the petitioner were not dis-engaged, rather the petitioner left the job at his own as in the cross-examination of the petitioner, he was put

to the suggestion that he himself abandoned the work at his own to which he has replied in the negative.

16. From the evidence of the parties, there remains no doubt that the petitioner remained working with the respondent and discharged duties of a Driver from 1998 till the date of his dis-engagement *i. e.* 31-10-2000 and a Driver is a workman within the meaning of section 2 (s) of the Act. As per the statement of the petitioner and the facts admitted by Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager, RW1, of the respondent society that the services of the petitioner were not dispensed with after following the procedure as laid down under section 25-F of the Act.

17. It has been stated by the petitioner while appearing as PW1 that he worked for more than 240 days in each calendar year of his service and this fact is not disputed in his cross-examination by the respondent. Rather Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, has admitted this fact in his cross-examination and therefore, the petitioner is held to have continuous service on his credit as per the provisions of section 25-B of the Act and automatically being a workman the petitioner is entitled for all the protections as provided under section 25-F of the Act, which reads as under :—

“25-F.— Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen .—

No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until :—

- (a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice ;
- (b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay (for every completed year of continuous service) or any part thereof in excess of six months; and
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the official Gazette).

18. The conditions enumerated in section 25-F are the conditions precedent and the provisions of the section 25-F are couched in mandatory form and non-compliance therewith has a result of rendering the order of retrenchment void, *ab initio* or nonest (State of Rajasthan Vs. Miss Usha Lokwani, 1994 LLR 369 (Raj.) in case titled “Auro Engg. Pvt. Ltd. Vs. R. A. Gadekar”, 1972 (1) LLJ 693, Mr. Justice B. N. Srikrishna, has explained the consequence of non-compliance of section 25-F of the Act, as under :—

“It is settled law that section 25-F of the Act was introduced into the statute book by parliament as a measure of amelioration. The section is specifically intended to soften the blow of unemployment which would fall upon a workman, who is suddenly deprived of his source of livelihood. Considering the constraining and the economy of the country as a whole and that of the industrial units, Parliament has limited this amelioration to what is specifically provided in clauses (a) and (b) of section 25-F, viz. payment of one month's wages in lieu of notice and retrenchment compensation calculated in accordance with clause (b) of section 25-F, the section imposes a mandatory duty on the employer which is a condition precedent to retrenchment of workmen. Consequently, contravention thereof, however, slightly vitiates the act of retrenchment, there is no difficulty in holding that breach of the said condition

invalidates the retrenchment and renders it void *ab initio*".

19. And therefore, the termination of the petitioner by the respondent for the reason that the respondent was left with no work due to the change of policy decision by the State Government, has to know the consequence for the reason that before dis-engaging the petitioner the respondent was required to follow the mandatory procedure laid down under section 25-F (a), (b) and (c) of the Act. Apparently from the facts, circumstances and the evidence of the parties, as has been discussed hereinabove, the respondent while dis-engaging the services of the petitioner from his service as a Driver of the respondent society, has not followed the mandatory provisions laid down under section 25-F (a), (b) and (c) of the Act and therefore, the termination of the petitioner is improper, unjustified and illegal.

20. Consequently, it is claimed by the petitioner while appearing as PW1 that though his services were dis-engaged by the respondent, but his juniors were retained in service in violation of the mandatory requirements of section 25-G of the Act.

21. Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager of the respondent society while appearing as RW1 has admitted in his cross-examination that the respondent had employed juniors to the applicant after his dis-engagement and Shri Bir Bahadur is still working with the respondent society. He also admitted that Shri Bir Bahadur is junior to the petitioner.

22. In view of the facts as referred to herein above, admitted by Shri Rameshwar Singh, PW1, in his cross-examination, the dis-engagement of the petitioner also appears to be in violation of the principle of last come first go, enunciated under section 25-G of the Act. It has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled "Deep Chandra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another". 2001 LLR 312, that in case the services of the workman is terminated in violation of the mandatory requirements of Section 25-F of the Act, the workman is entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his termination alongwith back wages. The observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is as under :—

"When an employee had put in service for more than 240 days in each calendar year for several years whether his services can be put to an end to without following the procedure prescribed under section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. If there has been violation thereof such an employee will have to be re-instated in his original Services on the same terms and condition in which he was working earlier. If this is the position of law, we fall to understood and as to how the High Court would have interfered with the award made by the Labour Court. The Labour Court therefore, rightly granted re-instatement with back wages and other consequential benefits.

23. In the present case the petitioner while appearing as PW1 has specifically stated that after his dis-engagement he is un-employed and that he has not worked in government or private section in any gainful employment. Whereas, the respondent had led no evidence on the record that the petitioner remained in any gainful employment after his dis-engagement. The respondent had also led to evidence on the record to show that the petitioner was at fault on account of any reason resulted in his dis-engagement and keeping in view the entire facts, circumstances and evidence on the record, the petitioner is not only entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal, improper and unjustified dis-engagement and therefore, he is also entitled for all consequential service benefits including back wages to the extent of 50 %.

24. From the evidence of the respondent and also from the cross-examination of the petitioner nothing has come on the record to show that the petitioner was at fault due to any reason for his dis-engagement and therefore, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner is held to be entitled for lump-sum amount of Rs. 2,000/- as litigation expenses. Accordingly, both the issues are decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELEIF

25. In view of my findings on above issues, since the termination of the petitioner is illegal and unsustainable and therefore, the petitioner is held to be entitled his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal termination. The petitioner is also entitled for all consequential service benefits including back wages to the extent of 50%. The petitioner shall also be entitled for a lump-sum amount of Rs. 2000/- as litigation expenses. The respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner within a period of 90 days from the date of announcement of this award failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full wages. The reference is answered accordingly.

26. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. The file after completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced.
6-6-2005

GEORGE
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Dharamshala, H. P.

Certified Copy of award dated 6-6-2005 passed by
Sh. George, Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial
Tribunal Dharamshala, H. P.

Reference : No. 119/2002 (RBT No. 150/04)

Instituted : on 16-5-2002

Decided on : 6-6-2005.

Shri Ramesh Chand son of Shri Prem Chand, r/o
Village Lower Lambagaon, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District
Kangra, H. P. .. Petitioner.

Vs.

The Management of the Tehsil Palampur Co-operative
Marketing and Consumer Society Ltd., Miranda,
Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, H. P. .. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes
Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Shri Vishal Sood, Vice Counsel

For the respondent : Shri Ajay Sharotri, Ac'v.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate Government :—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Ramesh Chand s/o Shri Prem Chand Village & P. O. Lambagaon-Lower, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, H. P. Part-time Chowkidar by the management of the Tehsil Palampur Co-operative Marketing & Consumers Society Ltd. Miranda, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra w. c. f. 1-11-2000 without complying the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified, if not, what relief and benefits the above workman is entitled to?"

2. "Whether the demand of Shri Ramesh Chand, workman for the grant of wages under the Minimum Wages Act, 1947 w.e.f. 12-7-1998 is proper and justified? If so, to what relief Shri Ramesh Chand workman is entitled to?"

2. On notice, the petitioner Ramesh Chand filed his statement of claim wherein he pleaded that he joined the respondent w.e.f. 12-7-1998 as Part-time Chowkidar and he was appointed on daily wages as such at Maranda. The petitioner further pleaded that since 1998 he was serving with the respondent society with utmost sincerity and that on 31-10-2000 he received a letter to the effect that his services were no longer required by the society. No reasons has been assigned as to why the services are not required especially when the society is not closing its venture. The petitioner averred that he has completed 240 days in the previous calendar year and the respondent had terminated his services without complying the mandatory requirements of law as the respondent has not served him with the notice as required under section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred in short as the Act) and as such the reference has been made by the Labour Commissioner. The petitioner averred that no compliance of any provision of the Act has been done by the respondent and thus, his termination is totally arbitrary, discriminatory, illegal in violation of provisions of Act in general and Section 25 in particular and thus void *ab initio* and his retrenchment is bad as the respondent is now engaging some person to perform the duties. The petitioner further averred that the respondent has retained his juniors and after his retrenchment he has not been anywhere gainfully employed. The petitioner therefore, prayed that the petition may kindly be allowed as the petitioner may kindly be ordered to be re-instated as a Part-time Chowkidar by revoking the illegal order of his termination dated 30-10-2000 with full back wages with interest and consequential benefits.

3. The respondent contested the claim petition filed by the petitioner and filed written reply wherein raised the preliminary objections that the petition as filed by neither competent nor maintainable before this Hon'ble Court, the petitioner is not entitled to invoke the jurisdiction as vested in this Hon'ble Court specially in view of section 92 of the Act, which bars the jurisdiction of the courts and in the matter, if petitioner has got some dispute with respect to his engagement/discontinuation, the same can only be adjudicated as per the provisions of the Act and thus, the present petition as filed is liable to be rejected. The respondent further raised the preliminary objection that the petitioner above stated has filed OA No. 2654 of 2001 titled Manoj Dixit and others Versus State of H. P. and others, which was filed on 16-9-2001, whereas, the petitioner appears to have been filed somewhere in the year 2002, the OA earlier in point of time praying the same reliefs, the petition as filed now is not maintainable and thus the petitioner is estopped by his Act, conduct and acquiescence and jurisdiction of two court cannot be invoked.

4. On merits, the respondent denied all other assertions made by the petitioner in his statement of claim. The respondent further averred that in view of the work which once accrued for which the services of the petitioner were engaged, having ceased in view of the policy of the State of Himachal Pradesh thereby taking a policy decision not to sell a few items through Society, no other source was left except to disengage the services of the employees who got rendered surplus. The respondent pleaded if a the petitioner not being workman, respondent being not industry, provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act cannot be raised and therefore, the petition is not maintainable. The respondent prayed that the petition may be dismissed.

5. The petitioner filed rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent wherein he re-affirmed and re-iterated the assertions made by him in his statement of claim and denied all the pleadings made by the respondent in their reply.

6. On the respective assertions of the parties following issues were framed for decision on 5-11-2004 :

1. Whether the termination of services of the petitioner w.e.f. 1-11-2000 by the respondent is in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and therefore, void and un-sustainable as alleged ? OPP.

2. If issue No. 1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief the petitioner is entitled to alongwith service benefits ? OPP.

3. Relief.

7. For the reasons to be recorded herein after my issues-wise findings are as under :—

Issue No. 1.	Yes.
Issue No. 2	As per operative part of Award.
Relief	The petition is allowed as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1 And 2:

8. Both the issues are inter-connected and hence taken together for discussions and findings.

9. The petitioner Ramesh Chand appeared as PW1 and he stated that he joined the services of the respondent w.e.f. 12-7-1998 as Part Time Chowkidar and was appointed on daily wages. His services were dispensed with by the respondent vide letter Ex. PW1/A without assigning any reason. He served with the respondent with utmost sincerity and to the satisfaction of the respondent. His services were terminated without compliance of mandatory requirements of Law. The respondent have not served any notice as required under section 25-F of the Act. Dis-engagement of the petitioner is arbitrary and illegal and as such, he is entitled for his re-engagement from the date of his termination. He had not worked anywhere from the date of his dis-engagement in any gainful employment. The respondent has engaged some junior persons and they are still in service. The petitioner was dis-engaged in an illegal and arbitrary manner vide order Ex. PW1/A w.e.f. 31-10-2000 which is required to be declared as null and void.

10. In his cross-examination, he was put to the suggestion that the respondent is a registered society and have its own bye laws, which he admitted as correct. He also admitted that he alongwith other workers filed a petition before the Administrative Tribunal which was later on dismissed as withdrawn. He was also put to the suggestion that he was engaged as daily wageer on purely temporary basis to which he replied in the negative. He had shown his ignorance that the State Government has withdrawn the work that is public distribution functions and other distribution and marketing work from the respondent that and due to the transfer of this work the employees worked with the respondent became surplus. However, he denied that he became surplus employee. He was also put to the suggestion by the respondent in his cross-examination that he had abandoned the work at his own to which he replied in the negative. However, he denied that his services were not dis-engaged in an illegal manner.

11. To controvert the evidence of the petitioner, the respondent examined one Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager of the respondent Society who appeared as RW1 and stated that the petitioner alongwith some other employees who were working with the respondent filed an OA before the State Administrative Tribunal in the same case. He also stated that in the year 2000 the

State Government has withdrawn the P. D. S. and fertilisers distribution work as a policy decision from the respondent society, and the respondent society was directed not to sell these articles through the society and therefore, the respondent society left with no source of other work and therefore, the employees of the society became surplus and the Board of Directors of the respondent Society left with no chance except to dis-engage the petitioner. He also stated that the applicant Ramesh Chand was earlier engaged as a Chowkidar on daily rated purely on temporary basis.

12. In his cross-examination, he admitted that the applicant worked as Chowkidar *w.e.f.* 1998 till 31-10-2000 as daily wager with the respondent society. Though he tried to clarify that the petitioner worked as workman and according to him workman means a person who works. He also admitted that the applicant worked for more than 240 days in each calendar year with the respondent society and no reasons has been as to why the applicant's services were dis-engaged. He also replied in the negative that the respondent has not employed junior persons to the petitioner after his dis-engagement. He admitted that Shri Bir Bahadur is still working with the respondent as Part Time worker, who is junior to the petitioner. He also admitted that no notice under section 25-F of the Act was ever issued to the applicant. However, he denied that the petitioner was not illegally dis-engaged.

13. The stand taken by the petitioner, as is emerging from the evidence of the parties as referred to hereinabove, is that the petitioner who was working as Chowkidar with the respondent society and worked as such from 1998 till 31-10-2000, his services were dis-engaged by the respondent in violation of the mandatory requirements of Section 25-F of the Act and that after the removal/dis-engagement of the petitioner his juniors were engaged and they are still working. These facts are not disputed in the cross-examination by Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, the only witness examined by the respondent to controvert the claim of the petitioner.

14. Whereas the claim of the respondent, as is emerging from the stand taken by the respondent in reply and also the facts stated in the examination in chief and the facts admitted in his cross-examination, it appears that the respondent is not denying the fact that the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged without any notice etc. as required under section 25-F of the Act, rather the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged for the reason that the State Government as policy decision has withdrawn the P. D. S. and fertiliser work from the respondent society and as such, the respondent society left with no work to engage the petitioner and other employees and therefore, the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged.

15. Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, has taken another stand while appearing as RW1 on behalf of the respondent that in fact the services of the petitioner were not dis-engaged, rather the petitioner left the job at his own as in the cross-examination of the petitioner, he was put to the suggestion that he himself abandoned the work at his own to which he has replied in the negative.

16. From the evidence of the parties, there remains no doubt that the petitioner remained working with the respondent and discharged duties of a Chowkidar from 1998 till the date of his dis-engagement *i. e.* 31-10-2000 and a Chowkidar is a workman within the meaning of section 2 (s) of the Act. As per the statement of the petitioner and the facts admitted by Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager, RW1, of the respondent society that the services of the petitioner were not dispensed with after following the procedure as laid down under section 25-F of the Act.

17. It has been stated by the petitioner while appearing as PW1 that he worked for more than 240 days in each calendar year of his service and this fact is not disputed in his cross examination by the respondent. Rather Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, has admitted this fact

in his cross-examination and therefore, the petitioner is held to have continuous service on his credit as per the provisions of section 25-B of the Act and automatically being a workman the petitioner is entitled for all the protection as provided under section 25-I of the Act, which reads as under :-

"25-F.—Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen :—

No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until :—

- (a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice ;
- (b) the workman has been paid at the time of retrenchment compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen day's average pay (for every completed year of continuous service) or any part thereof in excess of six-month's and
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate government by notification in the official Gazette)".

18. The conditions enumerated in section 25-F are the conditions precedent and the provisions of the section 25-F are couched in mandatory form and non-compliance therewith has a result of rendering the order of retrenchment void, *ab-initio* or nonest [State of Rajasthan *Vs.* Miss Usha Lokwani, 1994 LLR 369 (Raj.). In case titled "Auro Engg. Pvt. Ltd. *V.* R. A. Gadekar", 1992 (1) LLJ 693, Mr. Justice B. N. Srikrishna, has explained the consequences of non-compliance of section 25-F of the Act, as under :-

"It is settled law that Section 25 F of the Act was introduced into the statute book by parliament as a measure of amelioration. The section is specifically intended to soften the blow of unemployment which would fall upon a workman, who is suddenly deprived of his source of livelihood. Considering the constraining and the economy of the country as a whole and that of the Industrial units, Parliament has limited this amelioration to what is specifically provided in clauses (a) and (b) of section 25-F. *Viz.* payment of one month's wages in lieu of notice and retrenchment compensation calculated in accordance with clause (b) of section 25-F. the section imposes a mandatory duty on the employer which is a condition precedent to retrenchment of workmen. Consequently, contravention thereof, however slight vitiates the act of retrenchment, there is no difficulty in holding that breach of the said condition invalidates the retrenchment and renders it void *ab-initio*."

19. And therefore, the termination of the petitioner by the respondent for the reason that the respondent was left with no work due to the change of policy decision by the state Government, has to know the consequences for the reason that before dis-engaging the petitioner the respondent was required to follow the mandatory procedure laid down under section 25 F (a), (b) and (c) of the Act. Apparently, from the facts, circumstances and the evidence of the parties, as has been discussed hereinabove, the respondent while dis-engaging the services of the petitioner from his service as a Chowkidar of the respondent society, has followed the mandatory provisions laid down under section 25-F (a), (b) and (c) of the Act and therefore, the termination of the petitioner is improper, unjustified and illegal.

20. Consequently, it is claimed by the petitioner, while appearing as PW1 that though his services were dis-

engaged by the respondent, but his juniors were retained in service in violation of the mandatory requirements of section 25-G of the Act.

21. Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager of the respondent society while appearing as RWI has admitted in his cross-examination that the respondent had employed junior to the applicant after his dis-engagement and Shri Bir Bahadur is still working with the respondent society. He also admitted that Shri Bir Bahadur is junior to the petitioner.

22. In view of the facts as referred to hereinabove, admitted by Shri Rameshwar Singh, RWI, in his cross-examination, the dis-engagement of the petitioner also appears to be in violation of the principle of last come first go, enunciated under section 25-G of the Act. It has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled "Deep Chandra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another", 2001 L.R. 312, that in case the services of the workmen is terminated in violation of the mandatory requirements of section 25-F of the Act, the workman is entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his termination. In the present case the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is as under :—

"When an employee had put in service for more than 240 days in each calendar year for several years whether his services can be put to an end to without following the procedure prescribed under section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. If there has been violation thereof such an employee will have to be re-instated in his original service on the same terms and conditions in which he was working earlier. If this is the position of law, we fail to understand as to how the High Court would have interfered with the award made by the Labour Court. The Labour Court therefore rightly granted re-instatement with back wages and other consequential benefits".

23. In the present case the petitioner while appearing a PWI has specifically stated that after his dis-engagement he is unemployed and that he has no work in Government or private sector in any gainful employment. Whereas, the respondent had led to evidence on the record that the petitioner remains in any gainful employment after his dis-engagement. The respondent has also led no evidence on the record to show that the petitioner was at fault on account of any reason resulted in his dis-engagement and keeping in view the entire facts, circumstances and evidence on the record, the petitioner is not only entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal, improper and unjustified dis-engagement and therefore, he is also entitled for all consequential service benefits including back wages to the extent of 50%.

24. From the evidence of the respondent and also from the cross-examination of the petitioner nothing has come on the record to show that the petitioner was at fault due to any reason for his dis-engagement and therefore, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner is held to be entitled for lump sum amount of Rs. 2,000/- as litigation expenses. Accordingly, both the issues are decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

25. In view of my findings on above issues, since the termination of the petitioner is illegal and unsustainable and therefore, the petitioner is held to be entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal termination. The petitioner is also entitled for all consequential service benefits including back wages to the extent of 50%. The petitioner shall also be entitled for a lump sum amount of Rs. 2000/- as litigation expenses. The respondent is directed to re-engage the

petitioner within a period of 90 days from the date of announcement of this award failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full wages. The reference is answered accordingly.

26. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced
6-6-2005.

Seal.

GEORGE,
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Dharamshala.

Certified copy of the award dated 11-5-2005 passed by Hon'ble Shri George, Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, Camp at Sarkaghat.

Reference No. : 44/2001 (RBT No 29/04)

Instituted on : 9-4-2001

Decided on : 11-5-2005

Shri Joginder Pal son of Shri Milkhi Ram, resident of Village and Post Office Kamlah Fort, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H. P. ... Petitioner.

Versus

The Executive Engineer, H. P. S. E. B. Vidyut, Mandal, Dharampur, District Mandi H. P. ... Respondent

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Shri Jagdish Thakur, Adv.

For the respondent : Shri Sarwan Kumar, Asstt. Eng. AR.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication :—

"Whether the termination of the petitioner by the respondent as per standing orders of H.P.S.E.B. and juniors to the petitioner retained in service and the petitioner was not engaged as per section 25-H and 25-G, is valid and justified? If not to what service benefits the petitioner is entitled to?"

2. The petitioner filed his statement of claim whereby the petitioner alleged that he was engaged by the respondent on daily wages as Beldar in the month of February, 1998 and he remained as such till 20-4-1998 without any break. But the services of the petitioner were terminated by the respondent in the month of April, 1998 without any notice. The services of the petitioner were terminated by the respondent alongwith some persons namely S/Shri Kashmir Singh, Ajit Singh, Dharam Singh and Dharam Pal. The petitioner further alleged that he was again engaged by the respondent in the month of January, 1999 under the H. P. S. E. B. Sub-Division, Dharampur and remained as such till March, 1999 and thereafter all of a sudden the services of the petitioner were terminated by the respondent without complying with the provisions of Rule 14 (2) of the certified standing orders issued by the respondent Board. Despite the fact that as per the aforesaid rules, 10 days notice is necessary for the termination of any workman who has not completed 240 days in a calendar year. The similarly situated person whose services were terminated alongwith the petitioner were re-engaged by the respondent as per the directions of the Hon'ble State Administrative Tribunal. The petitioner further alleged that the respondent engaged the petitioner on perennial nature of work and the same stands available with the respondent. The respondent re-engaged some juniors to the petitioner

and they are still working with the respondent. The petitioner has prayed for setting aside the termination order and seeks directions from the court to re-engage him with all consequential benefits including back wages and seniority etc.

3. On notice the respondent appeared and they contested the claim of the petitioner and filed reply to the statement of claim filed by the petitioner wherein the respondent admitted that the petitioner was engaged as Beldar on daily waged basis for a specific period. The respondent alleged that the services of the petitioner were not terminated by the respondent in the month of April, 1998, as the petitioner has worked under H. P. S. E. B. Sub-Division Sandhol only upto 20th February 1998 and the petitioner was engaged on a specific work and on its completion the petitioner could not be engaged further. The respondent denied that the person juniors to the petitioner were retained in service. The respondent admitted that the similar situated persons were engaged by the respondent as per the directions of the Hon'ble Administrative Tribunal. The respondent prayed for dismissal of the petitioner.

4. The petitioner filed rejoinder, wherein he re-affirmed and reiterated the averments made in the petition and denied the assertions of the respondent made in the reply.

5. On the respective assertions of the parties, the following issues were framed on 16-7-2002:—

1. Whether termination of services of the petitioner without notice is in violation of the principle of last come first go and thus violative of the certified standing orders and section 25-H and 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and same is thus illegal? OPP.
2. In case issue No. 1 is proved in the affirmative, whether the petitioner is entitled to compensation and consequential benefits? OPP.
3. Relief.

6. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my findings on the aforesaid issues are as under :—

Issue No. 1	..
Issue No. 2	.. Yes
Relief	.. The petition is allowed as per operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1 And 2 :

7. Both the issues are inter-connected and hence taken together for discussions and findings.

8. The petitioner has claimed that he was engaged as daily wage by the respondent in the month of February, 1998 and he worked as such till 20-4-1998. Thereafter, he was disengaged by the respondent alongwith S/Shri Kashmir Singh, Ajit Singh, Dharam Singh and Dharam Pal. He was re-engaged in January, 1999 and he worked there till March, 1999 and thereafter, all of sudden his services were terminated in violation of provisions of Rule 14 (2) of the certified standing orders framed under the provisions of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946, without serving any notice as required under Rule 14 (2) of the said standing orders. He also claimed that the other persons who were disengaged alongwith him approached the administrative Tribunal and thereafter, they were re-instated. The respondent re-engaged some of the juniors to the petitioners.

9. Whereas, the claim of the respondent is that the petitioner was engaged on daily wages basis for a specific period and the petitioner has worked under

H. P. S. E. B. Sub-Division, Sandhol only upto 20-2-1998 and the petitioner was engaged on a specific work and on its completion the petitioner could not be engaged further.

9. The petitioner Joginder Pal appeared as PW1 and he stated on oath that he was employed as daily wage beldar in H. P. S. E. B. Sub-Division Dharampur/Section at Sandhol on 2-1-1998. He was not issued any employment letter, S/Shri Kashmir Singh, Ajit Singh, Sohan Singh, Dharam Pal etc. were also working with him. Dharam Pal was junior to him who is still working with the respondent. He was retrenched on 4-8-1998 without any notice and payment of retrenchment compensation. He worked for 108 days during the period 2-1-1998 to 4-8-1998. He was also given some fictional breaks during this period. The other persons who were working with him were also retrenched, but later on reinstated as per the orders of the Administrative Tribunal. The work against which he was employed is still continuing.

10. In his cross-examination, he admitted that he worked as per the details given in Ex. R/A and Ex. R/B during the period 2-1-1998 to 4-8-1998. However, he denied that he was engaged against specific work and on completion of which his services were no longer required by the Board, rather he volunteered at his own that he was performing the maintenance duties. He also denied that Dharam Pal was not junior to him.

11. To controvert the statement of the petitioner, the respondent Board examined Shri Suresh Kumar Thakur, Senior Executive Engineer, H. P. S. E. B., Dharampur, as RW1, who has stated that the petitioner was engaged for specific work at Sandhol and Dharampur. Since the specific work completed and the petitioner was disengaged as no work left for his re-engagement. He also brought on the record Muster roll Ex. RW1/A to Ex. RW1/F.

12. In his cross-examination, he admitted that at the time the petitioner was engaged no letter of appointment was issued to the petitioner by the respondent to make his appointment for specific work. He admitted that he was not posted at the relevant time at Dharampur and Sandhol, as he joined at Dharampur as Executive Engineer on 11-2-2002. He did not employ the petitioner as daily wage worker. He also showed ignorance as to when the work of 11 KV H. T. Line started and when it was completed. Though he tried to establish that the petitioner was engaged for the specific work of 11 K.V. H. T. Line. He also admitted that the Board has framed the certified standing orders and at the time the services of the petitioner were disengaged, the petitioner was not served with the notice as per the clause 14 (2) of the Certified Standing Orders nor any compensation was paid to him. He had also shown his ignorance that as to when Dharam Singh, Sohan Singh joined the board and also whether they are junior to the petitioner or not. He also admitted that after 21-7-1998 no Muster roll was issued for engaging the petitioner for any work. He himself stated that no work was left with the Board.

13. Shri Jagdish Thakur, Adv. has argued that the services of the petitioner were terminated by the respondent in violation of Rule 14 (2) of the Standing Orders framed by the respondents under the provisions of Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946, without serving any notice and payment of retrenchment compensation, as the services of the casual/daily wage worker in H. P. S. E. B. are governed by the standing orders as referred to herein above, and in case where a workman has not completed 240 working days, in that event the services of the workman are required to be dispensed with or terminated as per Rule 14 (2) of the said Standing Orders.

14. Shri Suresh Kumar Thakur, Sr. Executive Engineer, who appeared as RW1, on behalf of the respondent has admitted that the Board has the Standing Orders and at the time the petitioner was disengaged, he

was not served with any notice nor paid any retrenchment compensation as per the requirements of Sub-Rule 2 of Rule 14 of the Standing Orders. Since the respondent has not denied that the services of the daily wage worker is governed as per the Standing Orders framed under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946, and it is also admitted that at the time the services of the petitioner were dispensed with, he was not served with any notice nor paid any retrenchment compensation as per the requirements of Sub-Rule 2 of Rule 14 of the Standing Orders. The retrenchment of the petitioner thus appears to be violative of Standing Orders which is a legal force as it has been framed under the provisions of Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946, violation of which definitely makes the dis-engagement/termination as illegal and un-justified. Rule 14 of the Standing Orders reads as under :—

“Termination of employment :

- (i) No workman who has been in the continuous service of the H. P. S. E. B. for not less than one year as defined in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, shall be retrenched until he has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for such retrenchment and the period of notice has expired or he has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of notice or for such period as the notice falls short or one month. And further in this behalf principle of first come last go will be observed. Retrenchment compensation will be payable according to the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Explanation.—For the purpose of this clause retrenchment means termination by the H. P. S. E. B. of the services of workman for any reason whatsoever otherwise than as a punishment, inflicted by way of disciplinary action but does not includes :—

- (a) Voluntary retirement of the workman, or
- (b) Retirement of the workman on reaching the age of superannuation which shall ordinarily be 58 years but it can be extended up to 60 years with the sole discretion of management, or
- (c) Termination of service of 'workman' on grounds of continued ill health, or
- (d) Termination by way of punishment inflicted pursuant to disciplinary action.

- (ii) In those cases which are not covered by sub clause (i) services of a worker with less than one year's service are terminable by giving ten days notice in writing or pay and allowances in lieu of such notice, even without assigning any reason by either side, by the party, issuing the notice to the party on whom the notice is served. In case of shorter notice an amount equal to the pay and allowance for the period for which notice falls short of the required period shall be payable by party, serving the notice, to the other party. In case of workmen with more than one year's service, 30 days notice will be required. However, no notice is required to be served on a workman for terminating his employment where :—

- (a) A workman is engaged for a specified period not exceeding one year's continuous employment on one or more spells and in one or more trade,
- (b) An adverse report is received on his character and antecedents from the police or civil authorities,
- (c) He attains the age of superannuation,
- (d) He is convicted on a criminal charge by a court of law.

- (e) It is not expedient in the interest of the security the State to retain him in service.
- (f) He is declared medically unfit or he fails to appear before the appropriate medical authority (Appointed for the purpose by the employer) for medical examination, when called upon to do by any person authorised in this behalf.
- (g) He is dismissed (removed or discharged from the service as a measure of punishment.
- (i) The Executive Engineer shall maintain a waiting list of all temporary workmen whose services have been terminated on account of the completion of the work for which they were appointed or on account of the expiry of the period for which they were employed containing the following particulars, namely :—

- (i) Their names and address;
- (ii) The nature of work of occupation in which they were employed;
- (iii) The wages paid to them during employment; and
- (iv) The dates of termination of their services.

2. Whenever any vacancy in the Establishment is required to be filled, the persons, the persons included in the waiting list maintained under sub-clause (i) (a) shall be given preference after taking into consideration the nature of work done by them while in employment or the occupation in which they were employed and on the basis of the aggregate of their services in the Establishment prior to the termination of their services.

No person whose name is not entered in the waiting list shall be appointed in the Establishment unless all persons included in that list have been provided with employment in the Establishment.

- (h) He is appointed in a regular post
- (i) He absents himself or does not resume duty on the expiry of his leave.
- (j) He is an apprentices.

3. If a workman who has been served with a notice of termination by the H. P. S. E. B. wants to leave the job before the expiry of such notice he may be permitted to do so without being called upon to give any notice or wages in lieu of notice.

4. Every workman shall be entitled to a service certificate at the time of his discharge or leaving service and same shall be given to him on demand. Such certificate shall not be issued to a workman, unless he makes good recoveries outstanding against him (including wages in lieu of notice required to be served by him with reference to clause 14 (1) .

Explanation.—(i) If a workman loses his lien on his appointment under sub-clause (1) of clause 12 considered to have resigned under sub-clause 2 of clause-14 an amount not exceeding (14) fourteen days wages (if lying at the credit of the workman) in lieu of notice which he was required to serve as laid down in clause 14 (2) shall be forfeited to the H. P. S. E. B.,

- (ii) If services of a workman stand terminated on the expiry of specified term of appointment, he shall not be deemed to be retrenched under section 2 (00) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947”.

15. The bare perusal of sub-clause (2) of clause 14 of the Standing Orders as referred to herein above, reveals in those cases which are covered by sub clause (1) the services of workman with less than one year service are terminable by giving ten days notice in writing and pay

and allowances in lieu of such notice and in case of workman with more than one year service, 30 days notice will be required. No doubt that no notice is required to be served on a workman for terminating his employment where a workman is engaged for a specific period not exceeding one year's continuous employment on one or more spells in one or more trade.

16. In the present case, the claim of the respondent is that the petitioner was engaged for a specific period and on the expiry of the said period his services were terminated automatically and he was not required to be served with any notice under sub-clause 2 of Clause 14 of the Standing Orders.

17. The stand taken by the respondent is not supportable from any evidence from the record. The statement of Shri Suresh Kumar Thakur, RW1, is of no help to the respondent to prove this aspect of the case for the reason that he joined as Executive Engineer at Dharampur on 11-2-2002 and he admitted in his cross-examination that the petitioner was not engaged on daily wages by him and he has no knowledge as to when the work of 11 K.V. H. T. Line started and when it was completed. Though he tried to state that the petitioner was engaged for specific work on 11 K. V. H. T. Line, since the respondent has failed to examine any witness as to what point of time the work of 11 K. V. H. T. line was completed and who engaged the petitioner for this specific work after giving due notice to the petitioner of the same. There appears to be on evidence on the record to support this aspect of the defence taken by the respondent.

18. The respondent has led no evidence to prove that the petitioner was in fact engaged for the specific work i.e. 11 K. V. H. T. Line and also for specific period. In the absence of any evidence to prove this aspect of the case the respondent was legally bound to dis-engage the services of the petitioner in the manner provided under the Standing Orders which is the legal force as the Standing Order have been framed by the respondent under the provisions of Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946. The dis-engagement of the petitioner is violative of sub-clause 2 of clause 14 of the Standing Orders and therefore, is illegal and unjustified.

19. The petitioner while appearing as PW1 has stated that after his dis-engagement he is looking after the family fields which means that the petitioner is not totally un-employed and that he is not earning anything. He has not even led any evidence to state that while looking after his family fields he is not in a position to earn sufficient or that due to his dis-engagement he has suffered any monetary loss and as such, having regard to the totality of the facts, circumstances and evidence as has been referred to hereinabove, the petitioner is entitled for his re-instatement, as his termination is violative of sub-clause (2) of Clause 14 of the Standing Orders. But the petitioner is not entitled for any service benefits, accordingly Issue No. 1 and 2 to this extent are decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

20. In view of my findings on above issues, the dis-engagement of the petitioner is held to be violative of sub-clause (2) of clause 14 of the Standing Orders framed under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 and therefore, the petitioner is entitled for his re-instatement. But the petitioner shall not be entitled for any service benefits. The respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner within 90 days from the date of announcement of this award failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full wages from the expiry of said period. The parties are left to bear their own costs. The reference is answered accordingly.

21. Let a copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette.

The file after completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced.

Seal.

GEORGE,
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh.

Certified Copy of Award dated 6-6-05 as passed by,
Shri George, Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh

Reference No. : 72/2002 (RBT No. 113 04).
Instituted on : 4-3-2002.
Decided on : 6-6-2005.

Manoj Kumar s/o Shri Parkash Chand, V. P. O. Gugga
Saloh, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal
Pradesh .. Petitioner.

Vs.

Manager, The Tehsil Co-operative Marketing &
Consumer Society Ltd., Maranda, Tehsil Palampur,
District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh .. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes
Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Shri Vishal Sood, Adv.
For the respondent : Shri Ajay Sharotri, Adv.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate government:—

“Whether the termination the services of workman Shri Manoj Kumar s/o Shri Parkash Chand by the Management of the Tehsil Palampur Co-operative Marketing & Consumer Society Ltd., Maranda, Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh w. e. f. 1-11-2000 without complying with the section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits the said workman is entitled to?”

2. On notice the petitioner Manoj Kumar filed his statement of claim wherein he pleaded that he is a labourer and covered under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred in short as the Act) and his termination is without any notice and the same is illegal and in violation to the principle of justice. The petitioner further pleaded that he has completed more than 240 working days and his termination after the continuous and completion of about 8 and half years of service is illegal. The petitioner averred that the respondent is yet managing the business and the employees and officer and even the junior persons are yet in the service as namely Shri Bir Singh was employed by the Management in July 1997 and he is yet in service. The petitioner prayed for his re-instatement with full back wages and seniority from the date of his illegal termination along with interest @18% per annum alongwith compensation of Rs. 10,000/- for harassment and cost of litigation.

3. The respondent filed reply to the petition filed by the petitioner wherein they pleaded that the respondent society has been registered under Himachal Pradesh Co-operative Society Act and function under the same Act. The petitioner was engaged on daily rated purely temporary basis vide resolution No. 8 dated 18-5-92 and the Act is not applicable on the respondent as the employees of the society are governed by the service rules and bye laws of the society. The respondent averred that prior to the dis-engagement of the petitioner the society was having different type of business about Rs. 25 lacs, but the State Government transferred the entire business to Himachal Pradesh Civil Supplies Corporation & HIMFED and the respondent society

have no business and it was difficult to retain its labour and thus the respondent was forced to dis-engage their labour. The respondent prayed for the dismissal of the claim petition.

4. The petitioner filed rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent wherein he re-affirmed and re-iterated the pleadings made by him in his statement of claim and denied all other assertions made by the respondent in their reply.

5. On the respective assertions of the parties following issues were framed for decision on 11-8-2004:—

1. Whether the termination of services of petitioner by respondent w. e. f. 1-10-2000 without complying with the provisions of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act, 1947 is legal and justified ? OPR.
2. If issue No. 1 is not proved, to what relief of service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? OPP.
3. Whether the provisions of I. D. Act, 1947 are not applicable, as alleged ? OPR.
4. Relief.

6. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my issue-wise findings are as under:—

Issue No. 1	No
Issue No. 2	As per operative part of Award
Issue No. 3	No
Relief	The petition is allowed as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1 & 2 :

7. Both the issues are inter-connected and hence taken together for discussions and findings.

8. The petitioner Manoj Kumar appeared as PW1 and he stated that he joined the services of the respondent w. e. f. 18-5-1992 as daily wager Salesman and his services were regularised in the year 1993 as Salesman with the respondent. His services were dispensed with by the respondent vide letter Ex. PW1/A without assigning any reason. He completed more than 240 days in each calendar year. His services were terminated without compliance of mandatory requirements of law. The respondent have not served any notice as required under Section 25-F of the Act. Dis-engagement of the petitioner is arbitrary and illegal and as such he is entitled for his re-engagement from the date of his termination. He had not worked anywhere from the date of his dis-engagement in any gainful employment. The respondent has engaged some junior persons and they are still in service. The petitioner was dis-engaged in an illegal and arbitrary manner vide order Ex. PW1/A w. e. f. 31-10-2000 which is required to be declared as null and void.

9. In his cross-examination, he was put to the suggestion that the respondent is a registered society and have its own bye-laws, which he admitted as correct. He also admitted that he alongwith other workers filed a petition before the Administrative Tribunal which was later on dismissed as withdrawn. He was also put to the suggestion that he was engaged as daily wager on purely temporary basis to which he replied in the negative. He himself stated that he was engaged as salesman and his services were regularised. However, he had shown his ignorance that the State Government has withdrawn the work that is public distribution functions and other distribution and marketing work from the respondent that and due to the transfer of this work the employees worked with the respondent became surplus. However he denied that he also became surplus employee. He was also put to the suggestion by the respondent in his cross-examination

that he had abandoned the work at his own to which he replied in the negative. However he denied that his services were not dis-engaged in an illegal manner.

10. To controvert the evidence of the petitioner the respondent examined one Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager of the respondent society who appeared as RW1 and stated that the petitioner alongwith some other employees who were working with the respondent filed on OA before the State Administrative Tribunal in the same case. He also stated that in the year 2000 the State Government has withdrawn the P. D. S. and fertilisers distribution work as a policy decision from the respondent society, and the respondent society was directed not to sell these articles through the society and therefore, the respondent society left with no source of other work and therefore, the employees of the society became surplus and the Board of Directors of the respondent society left with no course except to dis-engage the petitioner. He also stated that the applicant Manoj Kumar was earlier engaged as a Chowkidar on daily rated purely on temporary basis vide letter Ex. RW/4.

11. In his cross-examination, he admitted that the applicant worked as Salesman w. e. f. 1998 till 31-10-2000 as daily wager with the respondent society. Though he tried to clarify that the petitioner worked as workman and according to him workman means a person who works. He also admitted that the applicant worked for more than 240 days in each calendar year with the respondent society and no reasons has been as to why the applicant's services were dis-engaged. He also replied in the negative that the respondent has not employed persons to the petitioner after his dis-engagement. He admitted that Shri Bir Bahadur is still working with the respondent as Part time worker, who is junior to the petitioner. He also admitted that no notice under Section 25-F of the Act was ever issued to the applicant. However, he denied that the petitioner was not illegally dis-engaged.

12. The stand taken by the petitioner as is emerging from the evidence of the parties as recorded to herein above, is that the petitioner who was working as a Salesman with the respondent society and worked as such from 1998 till 31-10-2000, his services were dis-engaged by the respondent in violation of the mandatory requirement of Section 25-F of the Act and that after the removal/dis-engagement of the petitioner his juniors were engaged and they are still working. These facts are not disputed in the cross-examination by Shri Rameshwar Singh, RW1, the only witness examined by the respondent to controvert the claim of the petitioner.

13. Whereas the claim of the respondent as is emerging from the stand taken by the respondent in reply Para-3 and Para-4, which reads as under and also the facts stated in the examination in chief and the facts admitted in his cross-examination, it appears that the respondent is not denying the fact that the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged without any notice etc. as required under Section 25-F of the Act, rather the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged for the reason that the State government as a policy decision has withdrawn the P.D.S. and fertiliser work from the respondent society and as such the respondent society left with no work to engage the petitioner & other employees and therefore the services of the petitioner were dis-engaged:—

Para 3 : "That prior to the dis-engagement of the applicant the society was having different type of business about Rs. 25/- lacs, but the State Government transferred the entire business to Himachal Pradesh Civil Supplies Corporation and HMFED and the respondent society have no business and it was difficult for the society to retain its labour as detail reply has already submitted before the Labour Inspector, Palampur".

Para-4 : "That the respondent was forced to dis-engage their labour and the same have

been disengaged *vide* resolution No. 4, dated 25-10-2000".

14. Shri Rameshwar Singh, RWI, has taken another stand while appearing as RWI on behalf of the respondent that infact the services of the petitioner were not disengaged, rather the petitioner left the job at his own as in the cross-examination of the petitioner, he was put to the suggestion that he himself abandoned the work at his own to which he has replied in the negative.

15. From the evidence of the parties there remains no doubt that the petitioner remained working with the respondent and discharged duties of a salesman from 1998 till the date of his dis-engagement *i. e.* 31-10-2000 and a Salesman is a workman within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the Act, as it has been held by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled "Management of Roneo Vickers India Ltd. V. Lt. Governor of Delhi", 1994 L. L. R. 253 (Delhi). As per the statement of the petitioner and the facts admitted by Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager, RWI, of the respondent society that the services of the petitioner were not dispensed with after following the procedure as laid down under Section 25-F of the Act.

16. It has been stated by the petitioner while appearing as RWI that he worked for 240 days in each calendar year of his service and this fact is not disputed in his cross-examination by the respondent. Rather Shri Rameshwar Singh, RWI, has admitted this fact in his cross-examination and therefore, the petitioner is held to have continuous service on his credit as per the provisions of Section 25-B of the Act and automatically being a workman the petitioner is entitled for all the protections as provided under Section 25-F of the Act, which reads as under:—

"25-F : Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen:—

No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until:—

- (a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;
- (b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay (for every completed year of continuous service) or any part thereof in excess of six months; and
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the official gazette)".

17. The conditions enumerated in Section 25-F are the conditions precedent and the provisions of section 25-F are couched in mandatory form and non-compliance therewith has a result of rendering the order of retrenchment void, *abinitio* or noneest (State of Rajasthan Vs. Miss Usha Lekwani, 1994 LLR 369 (Raj.). In case titled "Auro Engg. Pvt. Ltd. V. R. A. Gadekar", 1992 (1) L. L. J. 693 Mr. Justice B. N. Srikrishna, has explained the consequences of non-compliance of Section 25-F of the Act as under:—

"It is settled law that Section 25-F of the Act was introduced into the statute book by parliament as a measure of amelioration. The Section is specifically intended to soften the blow of unemployment which would fall upon a workman, who is suddenly deprived of his source livelihood. Considering the constraining on the economy of the country as a whole and that of the industrial units, Parliament has limited this amelioration to what is specifically provided

in Clauses (a) and (b) of section 25 F, viz. payment of one month's wages in lieu of notice and retrenchment compensation calculated in accordance with clause (b) of Section 25-F, the section imposes a mandatory duty on the employer which is a condition precedent to retrenchment of workmen. Consequently, contravention thereof, however, slight vitiates the act of retrenchment itself. When a statute mandates a duty as a condition precedent for affecting retrenchment, there is no difficulty in holding that breach of the said condition invalidates the retrenchment and renders, it void *abinitio*".

18. And therefore, the termination of the petitioner by the respondent for the reason that the respondent was left with no work due to the change of policy decision by the State Government, has to know the consequences for the reason that before dis-engaging the petitioner the respondent was required to follow the mandatory procedure laid down under Section 25-F (a), (b) and (c) of the Act. Apparently, from the facts, circumstances and the evidence of the parties, as has been discussed herein above, the respondent while dis-engaging the services of the petitioner from his service as a Salesman of the respondent society, has not followed the mandatory provisions laid down under Section 25-F (a), (b) and (c) of the Act and therefore, the termination of the petitioner is improper, unjustified and illegal.

19. Consequently, it is claimed by the petitioner while appearing as RWI that though his services were disengaged by the respondent, but his juniors were retained in service in violation of the mandatory requirements of section 25-G of the Act.

20. Shri Rameshwar Singh, Manager of the respondent society while appearing as RWI has admitted in his cross-examination that the respondent has employed juniors to the applicant after his dis-engagement and Shri Bir Bahadur is still working with the respondent society. He also admitted that Shri Bir Bahadur is junior to the petitioner.

21. In view of the facts as referred to herein above, admitted by Shri Rameshwar Singh, RWI, in his cross-examination, the dis-engagement of the petitioner also appears to be in violation of the principle of last come first go, enunciated under Section 25-G of the Act. It has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled "Deep Chandra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another", 2001 L L R 312, that in case the services of the workman is terminated in violation of the mandatory requirements of Section 25-F of the Act, the workman is entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his termination. In the present case the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is as under:—

"When an employee had put in service for more than 240 days in each calendar year for several years whether his services can be put to an end to without following the procedure prescribed under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. If there has been violation thereof such an employee will have to be re-instated in his original service on the same terms and conditions in which he was working earlier. If this is the position of law, we fail to understand as to how the High Court would have interfered with the award made by the labour Court. The Labour Court therefore, rightly granted re-instatement with back wages and other consequential benefits".

22. In the present case the petitioner while appearing as PWI has specifically stated that after his dis-engagement he is un-employed and that he has no work in government or private sector in any gainful employment. Whereas, the respondent had led no evidence on the record that the petitioner remained in any gainful employment after his dis-engagement. The respondent has also led

no evidence on the record to show that the petitioner was at fault on account of any reason resulted in his dis-engagement and keeping in view the entire facts circumstances and evidence on the record, the petitioner is not only entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal, improper and unjustified dis-engagement and therefore, he is also entitled for all consequential service benefits including back wages to the extent of 50%.

23. From the evidence of the respondent and also from the cross-examination of the petitioner nothing has come on the record to show that the petitioner was at fault due to any reason for his dis-engagement and therefore, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner is held to be entitled for lump sum amount of Rs. 2000/- as litigation expenses. Accordingly, both the issues are decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

Issue No. 3 :

24. It has been argued on behalf of the respondent side that the provisions of I. D. Act are not applicable in the present case as the petitioner does not fall within the meaning of workman. This aspect of the case has already been dealt by me as referred to herein above and it is settled position of law that a Salesman is a workman within the definition of workman as per section 2 (s) of the Act and has been settled in case titled Management of Roneo Vickers India Ltd. V. Lt. Governor of Delhi", 1294 L.L.R 253 (Delhi) and accordingly, the contention raised on behalf of the respondent that I. D. Act is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the present case is unsustainable. Accordingly, this issue is also decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

25. In view of my findings on above issues, since the termination of the petitioner is illegal and unsustainable and therefore, the petitioner is held to be entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working prior to his illegal termination. The petitioner is also entitled for all consequential service benefits including back wages to the extent of 50%. The petitioner shall also be entitled for a lumpsum amount of Rs. 2000/- as litigation expenses. The respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner within a period of 90 days from the date of announcement of this award failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full wages. The reference is answered accordingly.

26. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. The file after completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced
6-6-2005
Seal.

GEORGE,
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh.

Certified Copy of Award dated 1-6-05 Passed by
Shri George Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala Himachal Pradesh

Reference No. 385/2002 (RBT No. 394/04).
Instituted on 16-12-2002.
Decided on 1-6-2005.

Shri Mohan Singh son of Shri Mani Ram, r/o Village Jimjma, P. O. Dul, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh.
.. Petitioner/workman

V:

The Executive Engineer, H. P. S. E. B., Electrical Division, Jogindernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh.
.. Respondent/Management.

"Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947".

For the petitioner Shri N. L. Koundal, A. R.
For the respondent Shri J. S. Chauhan, Adv.

AWARD

The following reference has been received from the appropriate government for adjudication.

"क्या मोहन सिंह दैनिक बेलतन बेलदार को अधिकांशी अध्यायता, हि० प्र० राज्य बिद्युत बोर्ड मण्डल, जोगिन्दरनगर द्वारा बिना किसी कारण अधिकांशी बिना अधिनियम 1947 की धारा 25 जी व 25-एच की अनुपालना किए बिना नोकरी से बिनाक 21-10-1999 को निकाला जाना वैध है या अवैध ? यदि नहीं तो कामगार बिना राहत एवं क्षतिपूर्ति का हकदार है ?"

2. The petitioner filed statement of claim, averring that he was engaged as daily waged Beldar on muster-rolls w. e. f. 25-2-1999 and he remained as such till 20-10-1999. Thereafter the services of the petitioner were dispensed with by the respondent vide verbal order and without any notice, chargesheet, enquiry or sort of compensation under clause 14 (2) of the Certified Standing Order of the H. P. S. E. B. framed for its employees. The petitioner approached the respondent time and again for his re-employment but the respondent gave no response. Thereafter the petitioner raised demand notice to the respondent on 6-12-2011 under the Industrial Disputes Act. The petitioner further alleged that the respondent engaged him on muster rolls and he had worked upto 20-10-1999 and during this period the respondent engaged and dis-engaged the petitioner without any reason, as such the petition covered under the definition of continuous service within the meaning of section 25-B (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The service of the petitioner dis-engaged and the persons juniors to the petitioner were retained in service and therefore, the respondent has violated the provisions of section 25-G and H. of the Act, 1947. The petitioner has prayed for his reinstatement with full back wages including continuity of services.

3. The respondent resisted and contested the claim of the petitioner by filing reply, wherein the respondent raised preliminary objection stating that the petition is not maintainable, the petition is barred by limitation, the petition is bad for mis-joinder and non-joinder of necessary parties. On merits, the respondent admitted to the extent that the petitioner was initially engaged as Beldar on daily wages basis w. e. f. 25-2-1999 and remained depolyed as such upto 20-10-1999 with certain interruption and wilful absence of the petitioner. The averments that the respondent has given artificial breaks for 305 days between the period from 25-2-99 to 20-10-99 is wrong, as the petitioner remained wilful absent from the duties. The respondent averred that the respondent has not dispensed with the services of the petitioner, rather the petitioner left the job on his own. The respondent admitted that the petitioner served a notice for re-engagement in service but owing to non-availability of works and funds with the respondent, his request was not acceded to. The respondent stated that the work man namely Man Singh Prithi Chand, Seffi Mohammad and Durga Dass retained in service as they did not leave the job. The respondent alleged that the respondent has not breached any clause of Standing Orders framed by the H. P. S. E. B. The respondent has prayed for dismissal of the petition with costs.

4. The petitioner filed rejoinder wherein the petitioner reinstated and re-affirmed the averments made in the petition and denied the allegations of the respondent made in the reply.

5. On the respective assertions of the parties, the following issues were framed on 16-1-2004 :

1. Whether the termination of services of the petitioner by the respondent w.e.f. 21-10-99 is

violative of the provisions of I. D. Act, 1947, and certified Standing Orders framed by State Electricity Board ? OPR.

2. Whether the petition is not maintainable ? OPR.

3. Whether the petition is not barred by time ? OPR.

4. Whether the petitioner is estopped from filing the petition due to his act and conduct ? OPR.

5. Relief.

5. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my findings issuewise are as under:—

Issue No. 1 .. Yes.

Issue No. 2 .. No.

Issue No. 3 .. No.

Issue No. 4 .. No.

Relief The petition is allowed as per operative of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1 :

6. The petitioner Mohan Singh, appeared as PW1 and he stated that he was engaged as B. Idar by the respondent w. e. f. 25-2-1999 and he worked as such till 20-10-1999 and his services were dispensed with by the respondent by verbal order dated 21-10-1999 without any notice, charge sheet, and payment of compensation. After his services were dispensed with by the respondent, the respondent has retained number of junior persons to the petitioner namely Saffi/Mohad, Prithi Chand, and Gian Chand etc. He also stated that some new persons were also employed by the respondent namely; Om Parkash, Raj Kumar, Sanjay Kumar and Birbal. He also stated that he approached the concerned J. E. for his re-employment and he was told that as and when the work will be available he will be called for duty but he was not called. He did not abandon the job at his own. In his cross-examination he was put to a suggestion that he was not retrenched by the respondent, rather he himself abandoned the job on 20-10-1999, when he replied in the negative. He also denied that he left the job as he got another job with better emoluments.

7. To controvert the statement made by the petitioner respondent examined Shri V. S. Thakur, Asstt. Engineer, H. P. S. E. B., Sub division, Sundernagar, Mandi, as RW1, who has stated that the petitioner was engaged as daily waged by the respondent on 25-2-99 and he worked as such till 20-10-99 with certain breaks. He was not dis-engaged, rather he himself left the job at his own. We also Stated that the petitioner was not given any artificial breaks and no junior persons to the petitioner were employed. However, in his cross-examination, he admitted that neither the petitioner was employed on work by him nor dispensed with his services by him. He has made statement as per the record. He also admitted that the Board has certified Standing Orders, which is applicable to the employees of H. P. S. E. B. He also admitted in his cross-examination that no terms and conditions were settled and no appointment letter was issued to the petitioner at the time of his engagement. He admitted that the case is between the petitioner and the Executive Engineer, and he is not a party to the case. He further admitted that the name of the persons mentioned in the seniority list at Sl. No. 112 to 122 date of their joining has been shown against their names. He also admitted that muster roll vide which the petitioner was dis-engaged is not brought in evidence by the respondent.

8. The claim of the petitioner is that he worked from 25-2-1999 to 20-10-1999 and his services were dispensed with by the respondent by verbal order dated 21-10-99 without any notice, charge sheet and payment of

compensation. After his dis-engagement he continued to meet the Junior Engineer for his re-employment but the concerned J. E. told that he will be re-engaged as and when the work will be available, but he was not engaged.

9. The claim of the respondent is that the petitioner worked from 25-2-1999 to 20-10-1999 with breaks and he was not dis-engaged by the respondent but he voluntarily abandoned the job on 20-10-1999 and did not turn up for duty as he got another job with better emoluments.

10. It is admitted fact that the petitioner worked with the respondent as daily waged beldar w. e. f. 25-2-99 to 20-10-1999. The only point of dispute is that whether the petitioner was re-engaged w. e. f. 21-10-1999 by the respondent or he voluntarily left the job at his own as he got a better job with better emoluments.

11. The petitioner while appearing as PW1 has stated that he was dis-engaged w. e. f. 21-10-99 without any notice, charge sheet, and payment of compensation and he continued to approach the concerned J. E. who told him that he will be re-engaged as and when the work will be available but of no avail. The respondent has not examined any witness who was in charge of the petitioner at the relevant time i. e. during the year 1999 to prove that in fact, the petitioner was not dis-engaged and he himself voluntarily abandoned the job. Shri V. S. Thakur, (RW1) has admitted in his cross-examination that neither he kept the petitioner on work nor he dis-engaged him. He has made the statement on the basis of record. However, no such record has been brought in evidence on behalf of the respondent. The mandays chart Ex. RW1/C is brought on the record by the respondent which supports the version of the petitioner. PW1 has admitted that the respondent has certified standing orders applicable to the employees of the H. P. S. E. B., according to clause 14 of the certified standing orders framed under the provisions of the Industrial Employment standing orders Act, 1946 deals with termination of employee/ workman and sub-clause (2) of clause 14 of the said Standing Order, reads as under:—

14.2 In these cases which are not covered by sub-clause (i) services of a worker with less than one year's service are terminable by giving ten days notice in writing or pay and allowances in lieu of such notices, even without assigning any reason by either side by the party issuing the notice to the party on whom the notices to the party on whom the served. In case of shorter notice an amount equal to the pay and allowances for the period for which notice falls short of the required period shall be payable by part, serving the notice to the other party. In case no notice is required to be served on a workmen with more than one years service, 30 days notice will be required. However, no notice is required to be served upon a workman for terminating his employment where :

- A workman is engaged for a specified period not exceeding one year's continuous employment on one or more spells and in one or more trade.
- An adverse report is received on his character and antecedents from the police or civil authorities.
- He attains the age of superannuation.
- He is convicted on a criminal charge, by a court of law.
- It is not expedient in the interest of the security of the state to retain him in service.
- He is declared medically unfit or he fails to appear before the appropriate medical authority (appointed for the purpose by the employer) for medical examination, when called upon to do by any person authorised in this behalf.

(e) He is dismissed, removed or discharged from the service as a measure of punishment, service have been terminated on account of the completion of work for which they were appointed or on account of completion of the work for which they were appointed or on account of the expiry of the period for which they were employed containing the following particulars, namely:

- (i) Their names and addresses,
- (ii) The nature of work or occupation in which they were employed,
- (iii) the wages paid to them during employment; and
- (iv) the dates of termination of their services.

(2) Whenever any vacancy in the Establishment is required to be filled, the persons, the persons included in the waiting list maintained under sub-clause (i) (a) shall be given preference after taking into consideration the nature of work done by them while in employment or the occupation in which they were employed and on the basis of the aggregate of their services in the Establishment prior to the termination of their services. No person whose name is not entered in the waiting list shall be appointed in the Establishment unless all persons included in that list have been provided with employment in the Establishment.

- (h) He is appointed in a regular post.
- (i) He absents himself or does not resume duty on the expiry of his leave.
- (j) He is an apprentice.

12. According to terms of sub-clauses 2 of clause 14 of the Standing orders, the service of a workman with less than one year service, are terminable by giving 10 days notice in writing or pay and allowances in lieu of such notice. It is admitted fact that services of the petitioner were not dis-engaged as per terms of sub-clause 2 of clauses 14 of the Standing orders. The Certified Standing orders since has been framed under the provisions of Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946, therefore, it has the parity with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the protection afforded to workman under section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, is applicable for the workman who has completed one year continuous service. Sub-clause 1 of clause 14 of the certified Standing orders is parallel to the section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, where as sub-clause 2 clause 14 of the standing orders deals with procedure for dis-engagement of workman in the H. P. S. F. B. who has less than one year service at his credit.

13. The stand taken by the respondent that the petitioner has abandoned the job at his own, but the respondent has led no evidence to prove this aspect of the case. Shri V. S. Thakur, Asstt. Engineer while appearing as RWI, has stated that he has not kept the petitioner nor he dis-engaged him, as such his evidence is of no help to the respondent to prove the factual position. Though he tried to prove that he is making statement on the basis of record but he has not produced any record to prove his such version. Whereas statement of the petitioner to the effect that after his dis-engagement he continued to approach the respondent J. E. and he assured him that as and when the work will be available he will be engaged. It appears from the record that the petitioner was dis-engaged w.e.f. 21-10-1999 and he raised industrial dispute immediately and the matter was referred by labour Officer, on 6-6-2002 to the Labour Commissioner, who sent the same to appropriate forum/Labour Court for adjudication vide letter dated 11-12-2002. The factum of abandonment of the job is a question of fact the burden of proving of which lies on the respondents, but the respondent has not led any evidence to prove the

same, and accordingly, dis engagement of the petitioner is violative of sub-clause 2 of clause 14 of the Certified Standing Orders framed under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 applicable to the State Electricity board, and therefore, dis-engagement of the petitioner is illegal and unjustified and is liable to be quashed. This issue is decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

Issue No. 2 to 4 :

14. The respondent has neither led any evidence in support of any of these three issues nor any arguments were advanced on behalf of the respondent during the course arguments. Otherwise also, in view of my findings issue No. 1 above, and on the basis of evidence as has been discussed above, the respondent has failed to prove that the petition is not maintainable, the same is barred by limitation and the petitioner is estopped from filing the petition due to his own act and conduct. Accordingly, all the three issues are decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

15. In view of my findings on above issues, the dis-engagement of the petitioner by the respondent w.e.f. 21-10-1999 being violative of sub-clause 2 of clause 14 of the Standing orders, as such illegal and void, therefore, liable to be quashed. The petitioner is entitled for his re-instatement on the same terms and conditions in which he was working earlier to his retrenchment. However, keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case the petitioner shall not be entitled for any consequential service benefits including back wages. The respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner within a period of 90 days from today i.e. 1-6-2005, failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for full back wages. The reference is answered accordingly.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after completion be consigned to record room.

Announced.
1-6-2005
Seal.

GEORGE,
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Dharamshala, Himachal Pradesh.

Shinla-171 002, the 19th April, 2006

No. 1(A)3-8/91-Shram.—In partial modification of this Department Notification of even number dated 7-7-2004 and in exercise of the powers vested in him under section 9 and 10(1) of the Himachal Pradesh Shops and Commercial Establishment Act, 1969 (Act No. 10 of 1970). The Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to fix the Sunday as weekly close day (instead of Tuesday) for the Mall Road, Tibetan Market and Lakkur Bazar Shopping Complex covered under the said Act with immediate effect.

The opening and closing hours of these Shops and Commercial Establishments as well as interval for rest will remain same through out the year i.e. both in Summer and Winter Seasons as notified earlier vide notification dated 7-7-2004 referred to above.

By order,

Sd/-
Secretary (Lab. & Emp.).

निधि विभाग

आदेश

शिमला-2, 25 अप्रैल, 2006

Notaries Rules, 1956 is pleased to order the suspension from practice as Notary Public of Shri Swantra Kumar, Notary Public w. e. f. 23rd June, 2005 to 22nd June, 2006.

By order,

Sd/-
Principal Secretary (Law).

बहुदेशीय परियोजनाएं एवं विद्युत विभाग

प्रधिगचनाएं

शिमला-2, 21 अप्रैल, 2006

मध्या एल0 एल0 आर0ई (9) 14/2005-लेज.—श्री श्री स्वतन्त्र कुमार, अधिवक्ता को इस विभाग की प्रधिगचना संख्या एल0 एल0 आर0ई (9) 14/96-लेज, तारीख 9-3-1999 द्वारा जिला कुल्लू के प्रांती उप-मण्डल के लिए पब्लिक नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया था और उनका नाम नोटरी के रजिस्टर में क्रम संख्या 97 पर प्रविष्ट किया गया था,

और क्योंकि श्री स्वतन्त्र कुमार ने अपने व्यवसाय प्रमाण-पत्र की समाप्ति की तारीख से छः मास से भी अधिक समय के परबात तारीख 10-1-2006 को तीन वर्ष की और अवधि के लिए व्यवसाय के प्रमाण-पत्र के नवीकरण हेतु आवेदन किया था;

और क्योंकि श्री स्वतन्त्र कुमार नोटरी पब्लिक समाप्त हुई अवधि के दौरान नोटरी अधिनियम, 1952 और तदुपनि बनाए गए नियमों के उपबन्धों के उल्लंघन में इस प्रकार निरन्तर व्यवसाय करते रहे;

और क्योंकि श्री स्वतन्त्र कुमार को कारण बताओ नोटिस दिया गया था और उस द्वारा किए गए कार्य के विरुद्ध उस द्वारा लिया गया बचाव संतोषप्रद नहीं पाया गया;

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, नोटरी अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 10(डो) के साथ पठित नोटरी नियम, 1956 के नियम 13(12)(बी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री स्वतन्त्र कुमार नोटरी पब्लिक को 23 जून, 2005 से 22 जून, 2006 तक नोटरी पब्लिक के रूप में व्यवसाय करने से निषिद्ध करने के आदेश देते हैं।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
प्रधान सचिव (निधि)।

[Authoritative English text of this department Notification No. LLR-E(9)-14/2005-Leg, dated 25th April, 2006 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

LAW DEPARTMENT

ORDER

Shimla-2, the 25th April, 2006

No. LLR-E (9)-14/2005-Leg.—Whereas Shri Swantra Kumar, Advocate was appointed as Notary Public for Ani Sub-Division of Kullu district vide this Department Notification No. LLR-E (9) 14/96-Leg., dated 9-3-1999 and his name was entered at Serial No. 97 of Register of Notaries;

And whereas Shri Swantra Kumar, Notary Public has applied for the renewal of certificate of practice for further period of three years on 10-1-2006 i. e. after lapse of more than six months from the date of expiry of his certificate of practice;

And whereas Shri Swantra Kumar, Notary Public continued to practise as such during the expiry period, in contravention of the provisions of Notaries Act, 1952 and rules framed thereunder;

And whereas show cause notice was served upon Shri Swantra Kumar, and the defence taken by him against his actions has not been found satisfactory;

Now, therefore, the Governor of Himachal Pradesh in exercise of powers conferred by section 10(d) of the Notaries Act, 1952 read with rule 13(12)(b) of the

संख्या विद्युत-छ(5) 30/2005. —यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत परिषद् जो कि भूमि धर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 (1894 का पहला अधिनियम) की धारा 3 के खण्ड (सी0 सी0) के अंतर्गत एक सरकार के स्वामित्व और नियन्त्रण के अधीन एक निगम है, के द्वारा अपने धन्य पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः उप-मंडाल हरद्वार, तहसील महर, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश में 33/11 की 0 सी0 सब स्टेशन बेरी के निर्माण हेतु भूमि धर्जित करनी अति आवश्यक प्रेषित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि नीचे विवरणों में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का धर्जन प्रेषित है।

2. भूमि धर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना हेतु घोषणा की जाती है और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन भूमि धर्जन समारोह, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, पिसिल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3, हिमाचल प्रदेश को उक्त भूमि के धर्जन के लिए आदेश लेने का एतद्वारा निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. इसके अतिरिक्त उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा 1 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल यह निर्देश देते हैं कि अत्याधिक आवश्यक मामला होने के कारण भू-धर्जन समारोह, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, पिसिल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3, हिमाचल प्रदेश उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 की उप-धारा 1 के अधीन नोटिस के प्रकाशन से 15 दिन की अवधि समाप्त होने पर पंचाट देने से पूर्व भूमि का कब्जा ले सकता है।

4. भूमि का रेखांक भू-धर्जन समारोह, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, पिसिल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3, हिमाचल प्रदेश के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

विवरण

जिला : बिलासपुर नहसील : महर
वांछ : बसरा नं० रकबा
(बीघों में)

हरद्वार 75/71/55/1 0 7

शिमला-2, 18 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या विद्युत-छ(5) 20/2005. —यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड जो कि भूमि धर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 (1894 का पहला अधिनियम) की धारा-3 के खण्ड (सी0 सी0) के अंतर्गत सरकार के स्वामित्व और नियन्त्रण के अधीन एक निगम है, के द्वारा अपने धन्य पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः मंडाल चल्हा, तहसील लडभडोल, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश में उहल जल विद्युत परियोजना, तृतीय चरण के निर्माण हेतु भूमि धर्जित करनी प्रेषित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिगृहीत किया जाता है कि उक्त परिशेष में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणों में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का धर्जन प्रेषित है।

2. भूमि धर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा-6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना हेतु घोषणा की जाती

है और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, पिसिल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3, हिमाचल प्रदेश उक्त भूमि के अर्जन के लिए आदेश लेने का एतद्द्वारा निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि से सम्बन्धित रेखांक का निरीक्षण कार्यालय भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश में किया जा सकता है।

विवरण

जिला : मण्डी

तहसील : लडभडोल

गांव

खसरा नं०

रकबा
(बीघों में)

कुला (209)

307	0	02	14
410	0	01	04
5867/625/1/1	1	08	17
5871/5799/1/1	0	08	16
308	0	02	06
577	0	00	18
314	0	02	09

कुल 7 2 07 04

शिमला-2, 13 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या विद्युत-8-(5) 6/2005.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सतलुज जल विद्युत निगम लिमिटेड, झाकड़ी जो कि भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 (1894 का पहला अधिनियम) की धारा 3 के खण्ड (सी0 सी0) के अन्तर्गत केन्द्रीय सरकार के स्वामित्व और नियन्त्रण के अधीन एक निगम है, के द्वारा अपने व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन के लिए नामतः गांव दतनगर, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश में रामपुर जल विद्युत परियोजना के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्द्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिसर में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन सभी सम्बन्धित व्यक्तियों के लिए यह घोषणा की जाती है और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन भूमि अर्जन समाहर्ता, सतलुज जल विद्युत परियोजना, झाकड़ी, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश को एतद्द्वारा भूमि के अर्जन के लिए आदेश लेने का निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि का रेखांक भू-अर्जन, समाहर्ता, सतलुज जल विद्युत परियोजना, झाकड़ी, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

विवरण

जिला : शिमला

तहसील : रामपुर कृष्णहर

गांव

खसरा नं०

क्षेत्र
(हेक्टेयर में)

1	2	3
दतनगर	659	0 38 56
	660	0 25 70
	661	0 23 42
	682	0 21 59
	713	0 26 61
	714	0 20 30
	726	0 55 52
	727	0 16 36
	609	0 01 08
	688	0 13 10
	610	0 05 60

686	0	14	80
687	0	03	36
640	0	24	41
641	0	02	35
2210/642	0	03	52
2211/642	0	05	18
658	0	18	99
679	0	05	88
690	0	31	84
695	0	11	11
680	0	28	31
681	0	04	88
443	0	55	15
352	0	24	69
2213/444	0	01	76
445	0	01	68
446	0	02	40
447	0	08	76
491/1	0	00	60
491/2	0	60	91
492	0	03	36
493	0	02	82
494/1	0	01	70
494/2	0	27	08
494/3	0	00	56
494/4	0	00	36
495	0	00	66
496/1	0	01	33
496/2	0	10	77
496/3	0	00	80
496/4	0	00	32
592	0	03	10
594	0	01	92
596	0	00	30
618	0	30	50
621	0	35	14
2214/622	0	07	28
623	0	26	02
624	0	45	71
626	0	00	25
627	0	79	70
629	0	58	28
630	0	09	79
635	0	15	79
636	0	29	60
648/1	0	05	37
648/2	0	05	35
648	0	10	02
715	0	14	57
593	0	03	75
595	0	20	36
597	0	06	66
598	0	05	98
599	0	05	16
601	0	00	81
606	0	00	40
607	0	01	17
611	0	02	21
615	0	00	67
649	0	00	29
650	0	16	52
651	0	25	25
689	0	09	84
691	0	11	49
692	0	10	20
693	0	01	17
694	0	05	62

1	2	3	1	2	3
	2212/444	0 08 13			
	600	0 06 25		584	0 14 71
	602	0 05 80		577/1	0 01 05
	603	0 01 17		582/1/1	0 15 40
	604	0 44 28			
	358	0 15 68			
	359	0 22 14			
	605	0 13 88			
	608	0 03 91			
	612	0 11 90			
	613	1 64 31			
	614	0 04 12			
	616	0 00 80			
	617	0 02 50			
	619	0 00 18			
	620	0 00 96			
	2215/622	0 16 93			
	631	0 00 90			
	632	0 20 71			
	633	0 03 24			
	634	0 03 97			
किता .. 99		14 71 10			

शिमला, 18 अप्रैल, 2006

सदया विद्युत-छ- (5) 6/2003.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत परिषद् जो कि भूमि धर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 (1894 का पहला अधिनियम) की धारा 3 के खण्ड (सी० सी०) के अन्तर्गत सरकार के स्वामित्व और नियन्त्रण के अधीन एक निगम है, के द्वारा अपने व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव शमकोर, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश में गानवी जल विद्युत परियोजना स्टेज-II के बेयर साईट व इनटेक एरिया के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिसर में जैसा कि नीचे विवरणों में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. भूमि धर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना हेतु घोषणा की जाती है और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन भूमि धर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, पिसिल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3, हिमाचल प्रदेश को उक्त भूमि के धर्जन के लिए आदेश देने का एतद्वारा निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. इसके अतिरिक्त उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा 1 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल यह निर्देश भी देते हैं कि अत्याधिक आवश्यक मामला होने के कारण भूमि धर्जन समाहर्ता, हि० प्र० राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, पिसिल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3, हिमाचल प्रदेश उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 की उप-धारा 1 के अधीन नोटिस के प्रकाशन के 15 दिन की अवधि समाप्त होने पर पचाट देने में पूर्व भूमि का कब्जा ले सकते हैं।

4. भूमि का रेखांक भू-धर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, पिसिल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3, हि० प्र० के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

विवरण

जिला : शिमला		तहसील : रामपुर	
गांव	खसरा न०	रकबा (हेक्टेयर में)	
1	2	3	
शमकोर	587	0	10 49
	583/1	0	05 00
	583	0	49 37

1	2	3
	584	0 14 71
	577/1	0 01 05
	582/1/1	0 15 40
कुल किता .. 6		0 96 02

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षर/-
प्रधान सचिव।

लोक निर्माण विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 17 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या पी० बी० डब्ल्यू० बी० ए० (7) 1-10/2003.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव फाटी वशिष्ठ, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुलू में राष्ट्रीय उच्च मार्ग-21 को चौड़ा करने हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिसर में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणों में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि धर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और अधिकारियों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित अथवा अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सह्य प्राधिकार देने हैं।

4. कोई भी हितवद् व्यक्ति, जिस उक्त परिश्रम में कथित भूमि के धर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो, तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के तीस (30) दिन की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-धर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मण्डी के कार्यालय में दायर कर सकता है:—

विवरण

जिला : कुल्लू		तहसील : मनाली		
गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (बीघा बिन्वा)		
वशिष्ठ	482/3	0	02	04
किता	1	0	02	04

शिमला-2, 25 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या पी० बी० डब्ल्यू० बी० ए० (7) 1-92/2004.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु गांव फाटी जलू कोठी चोणए, तहसील व जिला कुलू में शाट-जलूपा सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित विवरणों में वर्णित भूमि उपयुक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. यह घोषणा, भूमि धर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना हेतु की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन भू-धर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मण्डी को उक्त भूमि के धर्जन करने के आदेश देने का एतद्वारा निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि रेखांक का निरीक्षण भू-ध्वजन समारोही, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मध्य क्षेत्र मण्डी के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

जिला : लखी	बिबरणी	तहसील	कुल
गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (बीघों में)	
1	2	3	
फासी जलू कोठी बोग	73	0 10 00	
	72/1	0 07 02	
	67/1	0 13 10	
	1966/1	0 15 05	
	1985/1	1 06 09	
किला .. 5		3 12 06	

जिमला-2 25 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या पी० बी० डब्ल्यू० बी० ए० (7) 1-93/2005. यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी ध्वज पर मार्क्सनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव गोहरमा, तहसील लाहौल, जिला लाहौल-स्पीति (हि० प्र०) में छद्मोक्त बिबरणी सत्यक सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि की जाती अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिनियम किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित बिबरणी में वर्णित भूमि उपर्युक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. यह घोषणा, भूमि ध्वजन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के पक्षीन इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों को सूचना हेतु की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के पक्षीन भू-ध्वजन समारोही, लोक निर्माण विभाग को उक्त भूमि के ध्वजन करने के पारेल लेने का एतद्वारा निदेश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि रेखांक का निरीक्षण भू-ध्वजन अधिकारी (एस० डी० एम०), लाहौल-स्पीति रिजर्व केसम के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

जिला : लाहौल-स्पीति	बिबरणी	तहसील	लाहौल
गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (बीघों में)	
1	2	3	
गोहरमा	5/1	0 17 00	
	65/1	0 06 00	
	66/1	0 04 00	
	67/1	0 03 00	
	68/1	0 14 00	
	87/1	0 09 00	
किला .. 6		2 13 00	

यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी ध्वज पर मार्क्सनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः भूमि अधिनियम अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिनियम किया जाता है कि उक्त परिच्छेद में वर्णित कि निम्न बिबरणी में निहित किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का ध्वजन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह घोषणा भूमि ध्वजन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पक्षीन धारा द्वारा प्रदान अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हेतु, राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों को उनके अधिकारों की सीमाओं को ध्यान में रखते हुए भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उक्त धारा द्वारा प्रोक्षित अथवा पक्षीन ध्वजन सभी कार्य को करने के लिए सर्वेक्षण अधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हिमाचल प्रदेश, जहाँ उक्त परिच्छेद में वर्णित भूमि के ध्वजन पर कोई ध्वजित हो तो यह इस अधिनियम के पक्षीन होने की सीमा (30) दिन की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-ध्वजन समारोही, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मण्डी के कार्यालय में दायर कर सकता है।

*महाराज मेला, तहसील महर, जिला मण्डी में मण्डी मेला मण्डीवाह सड़क के निर्माण हेतु।

संख्या पी० बी० डब्ल्यू० बी० ए० (7) 1-120/2005.

जिमला-2, 17 अप्रैल, 2006

जिला : मण्डी	बिबरणी	तहसील : महर
गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (बीघों में)
1	2	3
मेला/342	460/1	0 06 09
किला .. 1		0 06 09

तहसील : चम्बोट

*महाराज स्याज 70, तहसील चम्बोट, जिला मण्डी में स्याज सत्यक सड़क के निर्माण हेतु।

संख्या पी० बी० डब्ल्यू० बी० ए० (7) 1-5/2006.

जिमला-2, 18 अप्रैल, 2006.

स्याज	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (बीघों में)
1	2	3
294/1		0 18 12
295/1		0 00 06
296		0 10 11
381/1		0 15 14
385/1		0 02 10
386/1		0 01 14
388		0 00 12
390/1		0 11 08
390/2		0 01 07
491/1		0 01 18
492/1		0 03 06
493/1		0 01 10
494/1		0 00 12
496/1		0 02 01
497/1		0 01 07
502/1		1 08 17
किला .. 16		5 02 05

जिमला-2, 25 अप्रैल, 2006

संख्या पी० बी० डब्ल्यू० बी० ए० (7) 1-47/2005.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी ध्वज पर मार्क्सनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव मुना/49, तहसील बुना, जिला मण्डी में जंजीरी-जिल्ला-दमी सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि की जाती अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिनियम किया जाता है कि उक्त परिच्छेद में वर्णित भूमि उपर्युक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. यह घोषणा भूमि ध्वजन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों को सूचना हेतु की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के पक्षीन भू-ध्वजन समारोही, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मण्डी को उक्त भूमि के ध्वजन करने के पारेल लेने का एतद्वारा निदेश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि रेखांक का निरीक्षण भू-ध्वजन समारोही, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मध्य क्षेत्र मण्डी के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

विबरणी		तहसील : पनाय	
जिला : मण्डी		क्षेत्र	
गाँव	खसरा नं०	(बीघों में)	
मुलाह	794/251/1	0	11 04
किला	1	0	11 04

शिमला-2, 17 अप्रैल, 2006

गणनी 00बी० प्रत्यु० नो० 7) 1-24/2006.—यह हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रस्ताव होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामित गाँव बणो, तहसील कण्हाघाट, जिला सोलन में बिल-हगिपुर सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्पित करनी प्रपोजित है। धनपूर्व एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिशेख में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निविष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि गत अर्पित प्रपोजित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्पण अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के प्रयोग आग्री की जाती है।

3. पूर्वांक धारा द्वारा प्रयत्न शास्त्रियों का प्रयोग करने हुए राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इन उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और अधिकों को इसके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उस धारा द्वारा प्रपोजित प्रथम अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहवै अधिकार देता है।

4. कोई भी हितवद् व्यक्ति, जिसे उक्त परिशेख में कथित भूमि के अर्पण पर कोई आपत्ति हो, तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन होने के तीस (30) दिन की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-अर्पण समारम्भ, लोक निर्माण विभाग, बन्दर गिरुड, शिमला के समक्ष अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है।

विबरणी		तहसील : कण्हाघाट	
जिला : सोलन		क्षेत्र	
गाँव	खसरा नं०	(बीघा बिस्वा)	
1	2	3	
बणी	258/1	0	5
	259/1	0	4
	260/1	0	5
	317/309/271/218/1	1	0
	269/217/1	0	8

भाग-2—बैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएँ इस्यादि
Office of the General Manager, District Industries
Centre, Hamirpur (H. P.)

DECLARATION UNDER SECTION 24 OF THE ACT

Hamirpur, the 3rd March, 2006

No. Udyog HMR/DIC/M.M. Loan 2034 4193.—Whereas a notice was served to Shri Hem Raj s/o Shri Bakshi Ram, Vill. & P.O. Dhamrol, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur on 27-7-2005 under section 23 of H. P. State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 as modified and applied to Himachal Pradesh calling upon said Shri Hem Raj s/o Shri Bakshi Ram to pay to me the sum of Rs. 7000.00 as principal and Rs. 9922.00 as interest on or before the 29-8-2005 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I hereby declare that the sum of Rs. Seventy thousand as principal and Rs. Nine thousand nine hundred twenty two as interest total amount is Rs. 16922.00 due from said Shri Hem Raj s/o Sh. Bakshi Ram and that the property described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

1	2	3
112/1	0	6
215/2/1	0	3
210/1	0	10
152/1	0	4
153/1	0	2
178/1	0	5
154/1	0	16
155/1	0	7
133/1	0	8
160	0	4
136/1	0	2
140/1	0	4
142/1	0	2
141/1	0	5
143/1	0	1
161/2	0	18
277/167/1	0	1
276/167/1	0	1
168/1	0	2
170/1	0	10
173/1	0	5
174/1	0	11
175/1	0	12
169/1	0	5
159/1	0	3
किला	30	9 9

अधेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
प्रधान सचिव।

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

CORRIGENDUM

Shimla-171 002, the 26th April, 2006

No. Rev. D(F)11-11/2006.—Please read "6th October, 2005" and "sub-section (1) (b) of section 4" instead of 6th October, 2006" and "sub-section (1) (b)" respectively appeared in the first para of this Department's Notification of even number dated 21-4-2006.

By order,

Sd/-
Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

SCHEDULE

All assets present and to be hereinafter acquired by the loanee, whether the said assets are present or in future in his name including books debts, stocks shares premises and machinery and purchased with the aid on loan or a part thereof and any other personal security of the loanee.

SURITIES

1. Shri Ishwar Dass s/o Shri Girdhari Lal, Vill. Naku, P. O. Dhamrol, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur.
2. Shri Hari Chand s/o Shri Bhanu Ram, Vill. Ward No. 8, Hamirpur, Distt. Hamirpur.

Hamirpur, the 3rd March, 2006

No. Udyog HMR/DIC/M.M. Loan 2019.—Whereas a notice was served to Sh. Jagat Ram s/o Sh. Ghansai Ram, Vill. Dhar, P. O. Nagrota Gazian, Teh. Bhoranj (Hamirpur) on 27-7-2005 under section 23 of H. P.

State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 as modified and applied to Himachal Pradesh calling upon said Shri Jagat Ram s/o Shri Ghanaiya Ram to pay to me the sum of Rs. 2500.00 as principal and Rs. 4291.00 as interest on or before the 29-8-2005 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I hereby declare that the sum of Rs. Two thousand five hundred as principal and Rs. Four thousand two hundred ninety one as interest total amount is 6791.00 due from the said Shri Jagat Ram s/o Shri Ghanaiya Ram and that the property described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

SCHEDULE

All assets present and to be hereinafter acquired by by the loanee, whether the said assets are present or in future in his name including book debts, stocks shares premises and machinery and purchased with the aid on loan or a part thereof and any other personal security of the loanee.

SURITIES

1. Shri Raj Kumar s/o Shri Harji Ram, Vill. Nayar, P. O. Awahdevi, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur.
2. Shri Yog Raj s/o Shri Mangat Ram, Vill. Dhirar P. O. Nagrota Gazian, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur.

Hamirpur, the 3rd March, 2006

No. Udyog/HMR DIC/M.M. Loan 2048-4199.—Whereas a notice was served to Shri Harbans Raj s/o Shri Kishan Lal, Vill. Lalyar, P. O. Bagwara, Teh. Bhoranj (Hamirpur) on the 23-12-2005 under section 23 of H. P. State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 as modified and applied to Himachal Pradesh calling upon the said Shri Harbans Raj s/o Shri Kishan Lal to pay to me the sum of Rs. 2425.00 as principal and Rs. 5248.00 as interest on or before the 31-1-2006 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I hereby declare that the sum of Rs. 2425.00 as principal and Rs. 5248.00 as interest total amount of Rs. 7673.00 due from said Shri Harbans Raj s/o Shri Kishan Lal and that the property described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

SCHEDULE

All assets present and to be here inafter acquired by the loanee, whether the said assets are present or in future in his name including books debts, stocks shares premises and machinery and purchased with the aid on loan or a part thereof and any other personal security of the loanee.

SURITIES

1. Shri Rattan Chand s/o Shri Bhagat Ram, Vill. & P. O. Lalyar, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur.
2. Shri Khiali Ram s/o Shri Kapoora Ram, Vill. Lalyar, P.O. Bagwara, Teh. Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur.

Sd/-
General Manager,
District Industries Centre,
Hamirpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

भाग-3—अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समितिके प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनेंशियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर ग्राफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla, the 20th/21st April, 2006

No. HHC/13-2/S.81-8420.—The Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to make the following amendments in

कार्यालय सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाएं, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

कार्यालय आदेश

ऊना, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या ए० आर० कूप०/निरीक्षक मुख्यालय/2729-32.—जैसे कि दो सन्तोषगढ़ सहकारी थम एवं निर्माण सभा गीमित, दिनांक 21-8-1985 का पंजीयन संख्या 507 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत हुई थी और सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाएं के कार्यालय आदेश संख्या 3578-82, दिनांक 1-3-2000 के द्वारा विघटन में डाली गई है;

हालांकि विघटन द्वारा अपने विघटनाधीन कार्यकाल के दौरान सभा को पंजीकृत करने के प्रयास किए गए परन्तु वांछित परिणाम प्राप्त नहीं हुआ। सभा का दायित्व व प्राप्त्य सभा के अन्तिम/ता तारीख अंशेक्षण पत्र व निरीक्षण पत्र के अनुसार समायोजित हो चुकी है;

जैसा कि उक्त सभा के विघटन द्वारा अन्तिम प्रतिवेदन व निरीक्षक, सहकारी सभाएं हरोली ने अपने कार्यालय पत्रांक 338 दिनांक 29-3-2006 के अन्तर्गत उक्त सभा के पंजीकरण को रद्द करने की सिफारिश भी की है।

अतः उपरोक्त के दृष्टिगत, मैं, दिले राम धीमान, सहायक पंजीयक सहकारी सभाएं, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभाएं अधिनियम, 1968 (एक्ट नं० 3 भाग 1969) की धारा 83(2) के अन्तर्गत पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाएं, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए आज दिनांक 31-3-2006 को उपरलिखित सहकारी सभा के पंजीयन को रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

ऊना, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या ए० आर० कूप०/निरीक्षक मुख्यालय/2733-36.—जैसे कि दो गोन्दपुर तरफवला बुनकर सहकारी औद्योगिक सभा सीमित दिनांक 24-12-1957 को पंजीयन संख्या 271 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत हुई थी और सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाओं के कार्यालय आदेश संख्या 3453-57, दिनांक 1-3-2000 के द्वारा विघटन में डाली गई थी;

हालांकि विघटन द्वारा अपने विघटनाधीन कार्यकाल के दौरान सभा को पंजीकृत करने के प्रयास किये गये परन्तु वांछित परिणाम प्राप्त नहीं हुआ। सभा का दायित्व व प्राप्त्य सभा के अन्तिम/ता तारीख अंशेक्षण पत्र व निरीक्षण पत्र के अनुसार समायोजित हो चुकी है;

जैसा कि उक्त सभा के विघटन द्वारा अन्तिम प्रतिवेदन व निरीक्षक, सहकारी सभाओं, हरोली ने अपने कार्यालय पत्रांक 339, दिनांक 31-3-2006 के अन्तर्गत उक्त सभा के पंजीकरण को रद्द करने की सिफारिश भी की है।

अतः उपरोक्त के दृष्टिगत, मैं, दिले राम धीमान, सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाओं, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी सभाओं अधिनियम, 1968 (एक्ट नं० 3 भाग 1969) की धारा 83(2) के अन्तर्गत पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाओं, हिमाचल प्रदेश शिमला की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये आज दिनांक 31-3-2006 को उपरलिखित सहकारी सभा के पंजीयन को रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

दिले राम धीमान,
सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी सभाएं,
ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

the High Court of Himachal Pradesh (Use, Maintenance and Control of Staff Cars) Rules, 1981"—

1. *Short title.*—These Rules shall be called the "High Court of Himachal Pradesh (Use, Maintenance and Control of Staff Cars) (Seventeenth Amendment) Rules, 2006".

2. *Commencement.*—These Rules shall come into force with immediate effect.

3 Amendment.—In Rule 9, after clause +9-B, the following clause shall be inserted:—

“(9 C) Without prejudice to the official requirements, the vehicle in the general pool, if available, in rare cases, be provided to the High Court Staff, in emergency by the learned Registrar (Vigilance) on payment of usual charges as fixed from time to time”.

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

Sd/-
(J. N. BAROWALIA),
Registrar (Rules).

Shimla-1, the 20th/21st April, 2006

No. HHC/Rules/Vol.-V/97-8402. In exercise of the powers vested in it under Section 23 of the State of Himachal Pradesh Act, 1970, Section 129 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 as amended from time to time, Article 225 of the Constitution of India and all other powers enabling hereunto, the High Court of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make the following amendments in the ‘High Court of Himachal Pradesh (Appellate Side) Rules, 1977’ :—

1. These Rules shall be called the High Court of Himachal Pradesh (Appellate Side) (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 2006.

2. These Rules shall come into force with immediate effect.

3. Rule 1 (iii), Chapter 4 of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh (Appellate Side) Rules, 1979 is substituted as under :—

“To receive and dispose of all applications under Order 22, Rules 2, 3, 4, 10 and 10-A of the Code and to amend the record, if necessary, except in cases under appeal to the Supreme Court”.

New sub-rules (xvii), (xviii) and (xix) to Rule 1, after sub-rule (xvi) are added as follows:—

“(xvii) The matter for scrutiny of service shall, in the first instance, be listed before the Deputy Registrar/Additional Registrar to be nominated specifically for this purpose by the Chief Justice who may grant to the parties not more than three opportunities but within a total period of two months for taking effective steps for service of notice etc. If the party concerned fails to comply with the directions issued by the Deputy Registrar/Additional Registrar he shall after making a brief note, submit the matter to the Registrar, to be nominated by the Chief Justice for orders as per the following paragraph (xviii).

(xviii) The matter after submission by the Deputy Registrar/Additional Registrar shall be taken up by the Registrar to be nominated for this purpose by the Chief Justice, who upon hearing the party concerned and based upon the report of the Deputy Registrar/Additional Registrar, grant one, or at the most two more opportunities but within a total period of not more than six to ten weeks to the party concerned to comply with the directions. If despite such directions of the Registrar, the party does not do the needful within the time stipulated for the purpose, the Registrar should submit the matter for consideration to the Court alongwith his brief note.

(xix) Such cases where the Court itself, in the first instance, has fixed a time limit for filing reply/objections/rejoinders or other pleadings or for compliance of other directions in furtherance of the progress of a case and if despite such time initially granted by the Court, the party concerned has not done the needful, on expiry of the

period so granted by the Court in the first instance, the matter shall not be listed before the Court. Such matters shall be listed before the Deputy Registrar/Additional Registrar and thereafter, before the Registrar for extension of time, beyond the time limit fixed by the Court, as per sub rule (xvii) & (xviii) of these Rules:

Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rules (xvii), (xviii) & (xix), actual date matters and matters containing peremptory directions shall be listed only before the Courts.

BY ORDER OF THE HIGH COURT,

Sd/-
Registrar (Rules).

Shimla-1, the 20th/21st April, 2006

REGULATIONS FOR HOLDING COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE CADRE OF DISTRICT JUDGES/ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES BY DIRECT RECRUITMENT.

No HHC/Rules/22(25)/83 8454.—In exercise of the powers conferred under Rule 2 (i) (g) (i) & (ii) read with Rule 5, of the Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service Rule, 2004, the High Court of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make the following amendments in “The Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service (Competitive Examination for the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges), Regulations, 2005” :—

1. **Short title.**—These Regulations shall be called “the Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service (Competitive Examination for the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges) (1st Amendment) Regulations, 2006.”

2. **Commencement.**—They shall come into force with immediate effect.

3. **Amendment.**—Regulation No. 3(c) to the Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service (Competitive Examination for the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges), Regulations, 2005, shall be substituted as follows:—

3. **Definitions (c).**—“Examination” means the competitive examination under these Regulations and includes the “Preliminary” as well as “Main” examinations.

4. Regulation No. 7 to The Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service (Competitive Examination for the cadre of District Judges/ Additional District Judges), Regulations, 2005, shall be substituted as follows:—

7. **Holding and Conduct of Competitive Examination.**—The competitive examination for appointment to the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges, to be appointed by direct recruitment, shall consist of :—

(i) **Preliminary examination:**

All the candidates who apply for the post(s) and are found eligible shall be called for a preliminary examination which shall be an objective type examination, consisting of the following three papers of 100 marks each:—

- (a) Civil Law
- (b) Criminal Law
- (c) General Knowledge

Each paper shall be of one hour duration and examination in all the three papers shall be held on the same day.

(ii) *Main examination :*

On the basis of the merit obtained in the preliminary examination, candidates equal to thirty five times the number of vacancies to be filled in shall be called for taking the main examination :

Provided that minimum number of candidates to be called for appearing in the main examination shall be seventy five.

The papers/subjects for the main examination and the maximum marks for each paper shall be as follows :

Sl No.	Subject Paper	Maximum marks
1	2	3
1	Criminal Law	200
2	Civil Law, including Land Revenue Law.	200
3	Constitutional Law	200
4	General Knowledge including English Composition.	200
Total		800

The syllabus for the preliminary and the main examination shall be as is prescribed in the Schedule-II to these Regulations.

(iii) *Viva-Voce :*

Out of the candidates who qualify the main examination, according to the merit obtained therein, candidates shall be called for *viva-voce* in accordance with Regulation 10 (v). The *viva-voce* shall carry an aggregate marks of 300

5. Regulation No. 9 to The Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service (Competitive Examination for the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges), Regulations, 2005, shall be substituted as follows:

9. *Answer books:* (i) The Secretary shall supply the requisite number of question-cum-answer papers for the preliminary examinations. The instructions to the candidates shall be contained in the beginning of each question-cum-answer paper. All the said question-cum-answer papers shall bear the seal of the Secretary or shall be signed by the Superintendent of the Examination.

(ii) The Secretary shall supply the required number of blank answer books as well as question papers for the examination. The first page of every answer book shall contain the instructions. The answer books shall bear the seal of the Secretary or shall be signed and stamped by the Superintendent of examination.

(iii) Answer by the candidates must be written legibly on both sides of the paper. On no account shall any sheet or part of a sheet be torn or removed from any answer book. The candidates shall not write their names or put any other mark(s) anywhere in the answer book which may indicate their identity.

(iv) All answer books collected from the candidates shall be packed immediately on the conclusion of each paper and shall be sealed by the secretary/superintendent (examination) and forwarded to the examiners as quickly as possible.

(v) At the close of the examination an account of the answer books received and used together with all the unused answer books shall be drawn.

(vi) The answer books shall be kept for record for one year the declaration of the result.

6. Regulation No. 10 to The Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service (Competitive Examination for the Cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges), Regulations, 2005, shall be substituted as follows:

10. *Evaluation of the answer books and publication of the result:* (i) The examiner(s) who set the question papers for the preliminary examination shall prepare the key (answer) which shall be handed over to the Secretary in a sealed cover. On the basis of the key (answer) the Secretary shall cause the question-cum answer book of the preliminary examination to be evaluated and accordingly also prepare the award list and marks sheet immediately.

If in any preliminary examination a very large number of candidates appear, the examination committee may in its discretion decide to have the papers evaluated for marking through electronic means.

(ii) The Secretary shall cause the answer books of various papers of the main examination evaluated from the examiners appointed by the Committee and the examiners shall prepare award lists and marks sheets and forward the same to the Secretary alongwith the answer books within a month of the receipt of the answer books by them.

(iii) The result shall be compiled by the Secretary on receipt of the award lists and marks sheets and shall be placed before the Committee for its approval, with such recommendations, as may be deemed necessary.

(iv) No candidate shall be considered to have qualified in the "Main Examination" unless he obtains a minimum of 50% of marks in each individual paper and 55% in aggregate.

(v) For each vacancy, five candidates shall be called for *viva-voce* from out of the candidates who qualify the main examination prescribed in the manner indicated hereinabove, strictly in order of merit.

(vi) The marks obtained in *viva-voce* shall be added to the marks obtained in the main examination for preparing a select list of successful candidates. The select list so prepared shall remain valid for a period of one year from the date of its preparation.

(vii) The Secretary shall cause the select list and the result of the examination to be notified and published in the manner directed by the Committee. The Committee may also decide to inform the selected candidates about the result of the examination and/or the fact of their having been selected.

(viii) Based on the result of the examination the High Court may make appropriate recommendation to the State Government for issuance of appointment orders in accordance with Article 233 of the Constitution of India.

7. Schedule-I annexed to "The Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service (Competitive Examination for the cadre of District Judges/Additional District Judges), Regulations, 2005, shall stand amended as per amended Schedule-I enclosed with this amendment.

By order,
J N BAROVALIA,
Registrar (Rules).

SCHEDULE-I
(R for to Regulation 7)

BOOKS AND SYLLABUS FOR EXAMINATION FOR THE CADRE OF DISTRICT JUDGES/ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES BY DIRECT RECRUITMENT FROM AMONGST ELIGIBLE ADVOCATES.

First Paper

Criminal Law including Special Laws

- (1) *Major Manual* (a) The Indian Penal Code, 1860
- (b) The Criminal Procedure Code, 1973
- (c) The Indian Evidence Act, 1872

- (2) The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1986
- (3) The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988
- (4) The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989
- (5) The Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954
- (6) The Indian Forest Act, 1927

अथ विभाग

अधिवचनाएं

जिमा-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

Second Paper

Civil Law including local laws of Himachal Pradesh

- (a) The Code of Civil Procedure, 1908
- (b) The Indian Evidence Act, 1872
- (c) The Transfer of Property Act, 1882
- (d) The Guardian & Wards Act, 1890
- (e) The Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956
- (f) The Hindu Marriage Act, 1955
- (g) The Hindu Succession Act, 1956
- (h) The Land Acquisition Act, 1894
- (i) Indian Succession Act, 1925
- (j) Chapter No. X, XI and XII of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.
- (k) The Himachal Pradesh Rent Control Act, 1987
- (l) The Himachal Pradesh Tenancy and Land Reforms Act, 1972
- (m) The Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1953
- (n) The Himachal Pradesh Village Common Lands (Vesting and Utilization) Act, 1974.

Third Paper

Constitutional Law

- (A) Theory of Constitutional Law
- (B) Constitution of India

Fourth Paper

General Knowledge including English Composition

The knowledge of candidates regarding history, geography, current affairs developments in the recent past science and technology etc. etc. in so far as the English composition is concerned, the candidates would be expected to know about their command over English language including the drafting, writing articles, essays etc. etc.

Note: No bare Acts shall be supplied.

STATE ELECTION COMMISSION HIMACHAL PRADESH

NOTIFICATION

Shimla 2, the 5th April, 2006

No SEC' 56/2005 471 572 -In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-section (1) and (2) of the Section 5 and Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2006, I, hereby designate the following Officers of the State Election Commission as State Public Information Officers and State Assistant Public Information Officers required under the Act *ibid*, in the following manner, with immediate effect, in the public interest:

- (1) The Secretary, State Election Commission, Himachal Pradesh, as State Public Information Officer in respect of the State Election Commission as per provisions contained in Section 5(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005.
- (2) The Superintendent Grade I, State Election Commission, Himachal Pradesh as State Assistant Public Information Officer, in respect of the State Election Commission as per provisions contained in Section 5(2) of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

By order,

RAJENDER BHATTACHARYA,
State Election Commissioner,
Himachal Pradesh.

संख्या 11-23/84 (नैव) आईओ डी0/06-मण्डी प्रयोहता-अरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Smt Kamti Devi d/o Shri Jagat Ram, Village Sen Ropru, P.O. Surwari, Sub-Tehsil Kotli, District Mandi (H P) Vs. The Chief Medical Officer, Mandi (H P) के मध्य नीचे विद् गद् विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है।

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझीता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदान की गई लिमिट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त प्रयोहता-अरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला अथ न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

धरा हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिवचना संख्या 19-8/89-अथ (नूत) दिनांक 7 दिसम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदान कर्तव्यों का प्रयोग करते हुए प्रयोहता-अरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदान कर्तव्यों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित अथ न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण हिमाचल प्रदेश की नीचे ब्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है:-

"Whether the termination of services of Smt. Kamti Devi d/o Shri Jagat Ram workman by the Chief Medical Officer, Mandi, District Mandi (H P) w. e. f. 24.8.1997 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 whereas junior to her retained as alleged by the workman is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?"

जिमा-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 11-23/84 (नैव) आईओ डी0/06-मण्डी—प्रयोहता-अरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Kishan Chand s/o Shri Mast Ram, (2) Shri Roshan Lal s/o Shri Soju Ram, (3) Shri Jhabe Ram s/o Shri Paras Ram c/o Shri N. L. Koundal, Legal Adviser (BMS) Balakrupi, P.O. Jalpehar, Tehsil Joginder-nagar, District Mandi (H P) Vs. The Divisional Forest Officer, Nachan Forest Division at Gohar, District Mandi (H P.) के मध्य नीचे विद् गद् विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है।

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझीता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदान की गई लिमिट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त प्रयोहता-अरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला अथ न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिवचना संख्या 19-8/89-अथ (नूत), दिनांक 7 दिसम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदान कर्तव्यों का प्रयोग करते हुए प्रयोहता-अरी, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदान कर्तव्यों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित अथ न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश की नीचे ब्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है:-

"Whether the termination of services of (1) Shri Kishan Chand s/o Shri Mast Ram, (2) Shri Roshan Lal s/o Shri Soju Ram, (3) Shri Jhabe Ram s/o Shri Paras Ram workmen by the Divisional Forest Officer, Nachan Forest Division at Gohar, District

w. r. f. 1811 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 is proper and justified if not what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?

1997-98

[illegible]

सीरी सीसीआर: विनायक समितिगत, 1987 की भाषा 12 (1) के
अधीन भगवतीमा समिकारी द्वारा पत्रिका की गई थी। यह पत्रिका
समितिगत की भाषा 12 की उपभाषा (B) के अधीन विनायक समिति
के अधीन भगवतीमा समितिगत की निर्णय विनायक विनायक नाम
समितिगत/सीसीआर के समितिगत का समितिगत की निर्णय विनायक नाम

[illegible]

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lal Bahadur Thapa s/o Shri Lal Bahadur Thapa workman by the Managing Director, M/s M T Microtek Info-soft Ltd., Plot No. 62, Sector 5, Faridkot, District Sultan (H P) w.e.f. 10.1.2001 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?

दिनांक : ११ मई २००३

संख्या ११/२२२ (बी३) शाहीन बी०/२२-गान्धन गन्धीकुटुम्ब।
 श्री जी गुरु गन्धी बी०। कि श्री Jai Singh s/o श्री
 Thandu Ram, Village Bari Rasau, P (C) & Tehsil
 Narjanganpali, District Ambala, Haryana Ex
 M/s. Gargati Paper & Ltd Village Khairi,
 Jilokpur Road, Kala Amb, Tehsil Nahan,
 District Simla (H P) के गुरु जीने दि० गु निमन
 गन्धीबी०। कि निमन बी०

बीच बीबीसविका विधान समितिगत, 1947 की प्राथ 12 (1) के अधीन अधिनियम समितिगत द्वारा पञ्चम की मधु निर्माण पर पञ्चम समितिगत की प्राथ 12 की उप प्राथ (2) के अधीन विधान करने के उपरांत अधिनियमगत के निर्माण विधान के विधान अधिनियमगत/बीबीसविका समितिगत के अधिनियम की प्राथ 12 के उप प्राथ 12।

[illegible]

Whether the formulation of samples of Shot Single &/s Shot Double Paper workman by the M/s. Pranti Papers Industries Limited, East Asia District, Gurgaon (Haryana) of R.I. 2003 without complying the provisions of the Industries Disputes Act, 1947 to prepare and notified 21 and what relief of samples benefits and amount of compensation that the above approved workman is entitled to?"

निमज्जति । ११ मन्त्रे ५॥१॥

मृतक का पता (पिता) श्री श्रीगंगा नारायण नारायण नारायण
 मृतक का पता (पिता) श्री श्रीगंगा नारायण नारायण नारायण
 श्री रामेश्वर सिंह c/o श्री रामेश्वर सिंह
 Village, Basola, P. O. Lodi Majra, Tehsil
 Nabagarh, District Solan (H. P.) Ex. M. R. R.
 Apparatus, Chowkiwala, Tehsil Nabagarh, Dis-
 trict Solan (H. P.) के पास ही है जो कि इस नगर निगम के क्षेत्र में
 है।

श्री श्रीगोविंद विद्या भवनियम, १९११ ई। सं० १। (१)
 के संशोधन समन्वयक भवनियम के संशोधन की गई विशेष रूप से
 भवनियम की भाषा १३ की संशोधन (२) के संशोधन विद्या भवन
 के संशोधन समन्वयक के संशोधन विद्या भवन के संशोधन विद्या भवन
 संशोधन विद्या भवन के संशोधन विद्या भवन के संशोधन विद्या भवन

[illegible]

"Whether the termination of services of Smt. Nehlan Devi w/o Shri Parmeshwar Singh workman by the Management of M/s K. K. Agarwal, Chowkibag, Nalgondh District, Solan (H. P.) w.e.f. 17.3.2004 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified if not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?"

11/11/2023

मं.क्र. ११२/७३ (नै.प.) पार्किंग नं०/७३ नावावर - यमोदरनाथ
भारी को गव्ह पतीस हौता है कि Sant Hasina Begum w/o
Shri Shamshad Ali c/o Sri Ramjan Mohd
Village Rasola, P O Luthi Majra, Tehsil
Nalagarh, District Solan (H P) Fr M/s K K
Apparels Chowkiwala, Tehsil Nalagarh, Dist-
rict Solan (H P) के पत्नी जीने निग मा विधायक
सोशोमिक विवाद है.

[illegible][illegible]

"Whether the formulation of services of Sind Housing Program was Sind Shikshak Ali workman by the Muz K. Appand Chokkewadi Taluk Nalgach District Sdun (H P) or not? If not, without complying the provision of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workmen be entitled to?"

ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਇਹ ਹੀ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਿ ਸਾਡੇ ਅੰਦਰ ਬੁੱਧੀ ਦਾ ਪ੍ਰਮਾਣ
ਜਾਂ ਮਨ ਦੀ ਖੋਜ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿਚ ਸਮਾਂ (Chandrayan) ਦੇ
ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਰੂਪ, ਭਲਕੇ ਸਮਾਂ 73 ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ 76 ਦੇ
ਗੁਣ ਸਿਰਫ਼ 1700 ਦੇ ਗੁਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਸਿਰਫ਼
ਦੇ H.P.W. Division No. 1 ਵਿਚ ਸਿਰਫ਼
ਸਿਰਫ਼ 1700 (H.P.) ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੇ
ਸਿਰਫ਼ 73 ਦੇ

[illegible][illegible]

Whether the termination of service of Sgt. Chandler at the Sherburne Barracks, explained by the Executive Engineer, H. P. W. H. Division No. 1, Winter Field Station, on 16th 1000 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1917 is proper and justified? If not what a list of service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to?

पिप्लिका १. ३१ मार्च १९६६

मंजरा ११/१/८६ (चैतन) साईको येन/७८ राबन परीहय
 श्री श्री नर नथीन कोका है श्री श्री Salim Ahmed, General
 Secretary, Nahar Foundry Mazdoor Panchayat
 Union, Nahar, District Sirmour (H P)
 Is, The Executive Engineer, H.P.W.D. &
 P.H. State Workshop (Nahar Foundry), Nahar
 District Sirmour (H P) ने म न कोने दिग म विषय
 पर पोसावि विचार है

[illegible][illegible]

Whether this demand must vide demand notice dated 11.1.2003 by the General Secretary, Nahan Laundry, Mahatma Park, Nagat Union, Nahan to the Executive Engineer, HEPWD & L&P, State Workshop (Nahan Laundry), Nahan coming to 15 unskilled workmen (list enclosed) to promote them as semi-skilled workmen against vacant post no. 1/110/1988 in the pay scale Rs. 630-1800 (legal and justified) if so what designation scale and relax the concerned workmen from the employer are entitled to?

दिनांक 1, 31 मार्च 2006

जिम-त-1, 31 मार्च, 2006

संख्या 11-1/86 (लेब) धार्ड 0 वी 0/00-नाहन.— धर्मोद्वारा-
शरी को यह पतीत होता है कि Shri Yasin Mohd. Village
Dhampur, P.O. Batamadi, Tehsil Paonta Sahib,
District Sirmour (H.P.) Vs. The Manager,
M/s Janak Palace Cinema, Trilokpur Road,
Kala Amb, District Sirmour (H.P.) के मध्य बीच
लिए गए नियम पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद परिणियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4)
के अधीन समझौता समझौता द्वारा प्रत्यक्ष की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त
परिणियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने
के उपरान्त औद्योगिक विवाद ने निम्नलिखित कि कि मामला भ्रम-
मामला/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को परिणियम के लिए भेजने योग्य है ।

धन: हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या
19/89-अम (बूज), दिनांक 7 मई, 1992 द्वारा प्रत्यक्ष
नियमों का प्रयोग करते हुए औद्योगिक विवाद परि-
नियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1)
के अधीन प्रत्यक्ष नियमों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले
को उक्त परिणियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित भ्रम व्यापार/य/
औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को भेजने आवश्यक कि गये
विवाद पर परिणियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

"Whether the termination of services of
Shri Yasin Mohd. workman by the Manager, M/s
Janak Palace Cinema, Trilokpur Road, Kala Amb,
District Sirmour (H.P.) w.e.f. 21-11-2003 with-
out complying the provisions of the Industrial Dis-
putes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not,
what relief of service benefits and amount of com-
pensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled
to?"

भाग-4 स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, स्थितिस्थान बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, मीटिंग्स और टाऊन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग

-मध्य-

भाग 5--व्यक्तिगत अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

न्यायालय उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, अट्रियाल (बवाडी), जिला चम्बा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश

मजरा नमर पुत्र श्री पूर्ण चन्द, निवासी गांव तकीरा, महमूल
अट्रियाल, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

नाम

ग्राम जनता

नाम इकम्पो हेतु प्राप्ति-पत्र ।

भी मजरा नमर उषा ने एक प्राप्ति-पत्र भ्रम हल्की गति
प्रस्तुत करने प्राप्ति की है कि उसका मही नाम मजरा नमर है
किन्तु मही ने पंचायत रिकार्ड ककीरा जट्टे में मजरा नमर
पुत्र पु. रंज है जो कि गलत है । मही नाम मजरा नमर रंज
कम के प्राप्ति जारी कि जाय ।

निहाय सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस दण्डाधिकारी द्वारा सूचित किया
जाता है कि उपर्युक्त मही नाम मजरा नमर पुत्र पूर्ण चन्द रंज
करने वाले किसी को कोई दण्डाधिकारी हो तो वह अपना दण्डाधिकारी
दिनांक 16-5-2006 को या इससे पूर्व प्रमाणित या प्रमाणित
हाजर नोटर इस न्यायालय में प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा मही नाम रंज
करने के प्राप्ति जारी कर दिये जायेंगे ।

संख्या 11-1/86 (लेब) धार्ड 0 वी 0/00-नाहन.— धर्मोद्वारा-
शरी को यह पतीत होता है कि The General Secretary, Mini-
sterial Staff Union, Nahana Foundry, Nahana,
District Sirmour (H.P.) Vs. The Executive En-
gineer, H.P.W.D. & I. & P.H. State Workshop
(Nahana Foundry), Nahana, District Sirmour,
(H.P.) के मध्य बीच लिए गए नियम पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद परिणियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के
अधीन समझौता समझौता द्वारा प्रत्यक्ष की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त
परिणियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा 5 के अधीन विचार करने के
उपरान्त औद्योगिक विवाद ने निम्नलिखित कि कि मामला भ्रम-
मामला/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को परिणियम के लिए भेजने योग्य है ।

धन: हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-
8/89-अम (बूज), दिनांक 7 मई, 1992 द्वारा प्रत्यक्ष नियमों
का प्रयोग करते हुए औद्योगिक विवाद परिणियम,
1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के
अधीन प्रत्यक्ष नियमों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले
को उक्त परिणियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित भ्रम व्यापार/य/
औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को भेजने आवश्यक कि गये
विवाद पर परिणियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

"Whether the demand raised by the General Secre-
tary, Ministerial Staff Union, Nahana Foundry,
Nahana before the Executive Engineer, H.P.W.D.
and I. & P.H. State Workshop (Nahana Foundry)
Nahana that Shri Prem Pal Singh, Daftri be either
promoted as Canteen Salesman or Clerk in the pay
scale of Rs. 950 -1800 w.e.f. 1-10-1988 is legal and
justified? If yes, to what designation, grade and
relief the concerned workman is entitled to? If not
its legal effects?"

हस्ताक्षरित/-
अभ्यास्यता ।

धारा दिनांक 12-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदान
में जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-

उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
अट्रियाल (बवाडी), जिला चम्बा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

In the Court of Shri Rakesh Verma, H. A. S., Sub-
Divisional Magistrate, Chowari, District Chamha
Himachal Pradesh

PROCLAMATION under Order 5, Rule, 20 C. P. C.
Application under Section 13 (3) of Birth and Death
Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, Sh. Amar Singh son of Shri Sant Ram,
r/o Aled Pan, Chuhana Tensil Bhattiwal, District
Chamha has filed an affidavit regarding the regis-
tration of date of birth 29-10-2001 and name Subject
Singh of his grand son in the Panchayat records
Jiyanta.

Hence this proclamation is issued to the general
public, if any objection/claim regarding the registration
of entry of date of birth, he may file his claim/objection
on or before 16-5-2006, in this Court, failing which
the necessary orders will be passed to the concerned
Gram Panchayat for registration.

(Given today under my signature and seal of the Court.

Soul

RAKESH VERMA,
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Chowari, District Chamba,
Himachal Pradesh.

ब अदालत श्री गजीब जर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री जगदीश नन्द पुत्र श्री ज्ञान चन्द, निवासी गांव खिरा, परगना
महान, तहसील इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राप्ति ।

बनाम

धाम जनता

प्रत्यार्थीगण ।

प्राधेना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्राधेना-पत्र मय
व्याप्त हल्की इस आशय से गुजारा है कि प्रार्थी की पुत्री गपना देवी
की जन्म तिथि 28-3-2001 है लेकिन धाम पंचायत के जियुस्ता
के परिवार रजिस्टर व जन्म रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि दर्ज न है ।
जिसे दर्ज किया जावे ।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इस्तहार सूचित किया
जाता है कि प्रार्थी की पुत्री की जन्म तिथि धाम पंचायत
जियुस्ता के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने पर यदि किसी को कोई उजर/
एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को असावन या बकावतन
प्रादालत अधोहस्ताक्षरी धाकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा
सकता है । हाजिर न आने की तूरत में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने
के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे ।

आज दिनांक 13-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत
में जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

सजीब जर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत श्री सजीब जर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री चमाक राम पुत्र श्री मन्गी राम, निवासी गांव बुडियारा, डाकघर
बुडी, तहसील इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राप्ति ।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थीगण ।

प्राधेना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्राधेना-पत्र
मय व्याप्त हल्की इस आशय से गुजारा है कि उसकी सौनमी मां
श्रीमती मोधा, जो प्रार्थी के माय रहती थी, का देहावत
दिनांक 27-2-2005 को हो चुका है लेकिन उनकी मृत्यु तिथि धाम
पंचायत जियुस्ता के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न है । जिसे दर्ज किया जावे ।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इस्तहार सूचित
किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी की सौनमी मां श्रीमती मोधा की मृत्यु धाम
पंचायत जियुस्ता के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने पर यदि किसी को कोई उजर/
एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को असावन या बकावतन
प्रादालत अधोहस्ताक्षरी धाकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है ।
हाजिर न आने की तूरत में मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश दे
दिये जायेंगे ।

आज दिनांक 13-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत मोहर
में जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

सजीब जर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत श्री गजीब जर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री देव राज पुत्र श्री येनावी राम, निवासी गांव बाक, मुआल
कल्लर, तहसील इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०) प्राप्ति ।

बनाम

धाम जनता

प्रत्यार्थीगण ।

प्राधेना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्राधेना-पत्र
मय व्याप्त हल्की इस आशय से गुजारा है कि उसके बेटे देवेन्द्र कुमार
की जन्म तिथि 30-5-2000 है लेकिन धाम पंचायत मोरनू के
रजिस्टर में दर्ज न है । जिसे दर्ज किया जावे ।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इस्तहार सूचित
किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी के बेटे की जन्म तिथि धाम पंचायत मोरनू
के जन्म रजिस्टर में दर्ज करने पर यदि किसी को कोई उजर/
एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को असावन या बकावतन
प्रादालत अधोहस्ताक्षरी धाकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा
सकता है । हाजिर न आने की तूरत में नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज
करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे ।

आज दिनांक 13-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत मोहर
में जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

सजीब जर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत श्री सजीब जर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री गोविन्द प्रसाद पुत्र श्री मदानंद, निवासी गांव व डाकघर
बनीबेन, तहसील इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राप्ति ।

बनाम

धाम जनता

प्रत्यार्थीगण ।

प्राधेना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्राधेना-पत्र
मय व्याप्त हल्की इस आशय से गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र केनव
की जन्म तिथि 1-5-2001 है जोकि धाम पंचायत बनीबेन के
रिकार्ड में दर्ज न है । जिसे दर्ज किया जावे ।

इस सम्बन्ध में सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इस्तहार सूचित किया
जाता है कि प्रार्थी के पुत्र की जन्म तिथि धाम पंचायत बनीबेन के
रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने पर यदि किसी को कोई उजर व एतराज
हो तो वह दिनांक 12-5-2006 को असावन या बकावतन
प्रादालत अधोहस्ताक्षरी धाकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है ।
हाजिर न आने की तूरत में नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश
दे दिये जायेंगे ।

आज दिनांक 13-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत मोहर
में जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

सजीब जर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इलहोजी, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत श्री रामशर सिंह, सहायक समाह्वी द्वितीय श्रेणी, सिपूता, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री बाबू राम पुत्र श्री जस्ता, निवासी बग्गा, डाकघर काथला, उप तहसील सिपूता, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

दरखस्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969

श्री बाबू राम पुत्र श्री जस्ता, निवासी बग्गा, डाकघर काथला, उप तहसील सिपूता, जिला चम्बा न इस अदालत में प्राथनापत्र पेश है कि उसक लड़के सुरज सिंह का जन्म 1-7-1999 का हुआ है लेकिन ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण का बेजोश इशतहार सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त सुरज सिंह का जन्म तिथि 1-7-1999 दर्ज करने बाब किसी व्यक्ति का कोई एतराज हो तो वह अपना उजर/एतराज अमानत या बकालतन दिनांक 15-5-2006 को प्रातः 10 बजे हाजर अदालत आकर पेश कर सकते हैं अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी और मृत्यु सिंह पुत्र बाबू राम का नाम ब जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व माहिर अदालत में जारी हुआ।

माहिर।

रामशर सिंह,
सहायक समाह्वी द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सिपूता, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री रामशर सिंह, सहायक समाह्वी द्वितीय श्रेणी, सिपूता, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

परसा उर्फ परस राम पुत्र जीता, निवासी मैहली, महाल अधवाड़, ग्राम पंचायत समाट, उप-तहसील सिपूता, जिला चम्बा।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय—प्राथनापत्र नाम दर्स्ती बारे।

उपराक्त प्राथी ने अधास्ताक्षरी को अदालत में प्राथनापत्र मय न्याय हल्ली इस आशय में पेश है कि उसका नाम पंचायत रिकार्ड में परस राम दर्ज है तथा राजस्व अभिलेख में परसा दर्ज है। प्राथी राजस्व अभिलेख में अपने नाम की दूहरवी परसा उर्फ परस राम के रूप में करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि प्राथी के नाम परसा उर्फ परस राम पुत्र जीता दिये जाने वाले कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को हमारी अदालत में हाजिर आकर अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकते हैं। उजर एतराज प्रस्तुत न करने की मृत में उपराक्त नाम दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व माहिर अदालत में जारी हुआ।

माहिर।

रामशर सिंह,
सहायक समाह्वी द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सिपूता, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री आर. के. प्रवी, मैरिज ऑफिसर एवं उप-मण्डल वरिष्ठाधिकारी, हमीरपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

1. श्री रि. के. 23 वर्ष सपुत्र श्री कान्हा राम, गांव धनाट, डा. फरीद, तहसील धुआनपुर, जिला हमीरपुर।

2. आभता रखा कुमारी उम्र 22 वर्ष सपुत्री या पत्नी पाल, गांव श्री हरगोबिन्दपुर, डा. धुमन, तहसील बटाना, जिला मुरदासपुर (पा. 410)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्राथनापत्र अधीन धारा 16 ऑफ स्पेशल मैरिज ऐक्ट, 1954 के अन्तर्गत शादी पंजीकरण बारे।

उपराक्त मुकद्दमा में श्री रि. के. व आभता रखा कुमारी ने दिनांक 20-8-2005 का हिन्दू रीति-रिवाज अनुसार बाबा बालक कर्मा मंदिर में शादी कर ली है जिस स्पेशल मैरिज ऐक्ट, 1954 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत किया जाता है।

अतः आम जनता एवं रिश्तेदारों का इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त शादी पंजीकरण करने वाले किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे या इससे पहले अमानतन या बकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर पेश कर अन्यथा शादी पंजीकरण करने वाले आगामी कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 2-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व माहिर अदालत में जारी किया गया।

माहिर।

आर. के. प्रवी,

मैरिज ऑफिसर/

उप-मण्डल वरिष्ठाधिकारी, हमीरपुर,
जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री रामशर, सहायक समाह्वी द्वितीय श्रेणी, बैजनाथ तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

केस नम्बर. 11/NT/05

उनवान. तकसीम भूमि

पम्बा देवी पुत्री नारायण दास विधवा फकीर चन्द, बामो नगराटा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा बजरिया मुख्या ग्राम मिनजानिब विजय पाल पुत्र फकीर चन्द, बामो नगराटा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा प्राथीगण।

बनाम

1. रमेश चन्द पुत्र धनन्त राम, बामो कोटली, मोजा बीड, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, 2. सुरिन्द्र मोहन पुत्र बंद प्रकाश, बामो कोटली, मोजा बीड, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा प्रातिवादीगण।

तकसीम भूमि खाना नं. 167, खतोंना 310, खसरा 740, रकबा 0-21-20 है।, मूला कोटली, मोजा बीड, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

उपराक्त मुकद्दमा तकसीम में प्रतिवादीगण को इस न्यायालय द्वारा समन जारी किये गये परन्तु तामील न हो सका। अतः इस न्यायालय को यह विश्वास हो गया है कि प्रतिवादीगण की तामील सागरण तरीका से नहीं हो सकती है।

इसलिए इशतहार राजपल द्वारा समस्त प्रतिवादीगण को सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 15-5-2006 को इस मुकद्दमा की पक्षी हनु व्यक्तित्व रूप में या किसी अधिकृत के माध्यम से इस न्यायालय में अभिप्रेत आगे अन्यथा अनुपस्थिति की अवस्था में नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 31-3-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व माहिर अदालत में जारी किया गया।

माहिर।

रामशर,

सहायक समाह्वी द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि. 310)।

ब धराजित श्री रामराज, महायक समाहता द्वितीय खेजी, बैजनाथ
तहसील, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब धराजित श्री हेम चन्द ठाकुर, महायक समाहता प्रथम खेजी एवं
कार्यकारी दण्डीधिकारी, फतेहपुर, तहसील, जिला कांगड़ा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश

कम नं० - 53/NT/04

नवनीत नरनाथ भूमि

कम नं० 1/100

तारीख पेजा: 23-5-2006

1. अनिल कुमार, 2. सुभाष चन्द, 3. मोहिन्दर पाल, 4. मनाज
कुमार पुत्रान, श्री अनन्त राम उर्फ ग्याति राम, सभी निवासीगण पपरा, बांसी
पपराणा, तहसील बैजनाथ ।

श्री गतिचन्द सिंह पुत्र श्री श्रीम सिंह, मन्कन हदवाल, तहसील
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी ।

बनाम

विषय, प्राचीना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
धार्मिक, 1969

1. बाका देवी पुत्री धनी राम व पत्नी श्री राजिन्दर मूढ, बांसी
पठिवार, तहसील धर्मशाना, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) 2. पवन कुमार
पुत्र प्यार चन्द मूढ, बांसी भवारना, तहसील पालमपुर, 3. आश पृथ
प्यार चन्द मूढ, बांसी भवारना, तहसील पालमपुर, 4. राजिन्दर देवी
विधवा सुरिन्द कुमार, बांसी पपराणा, तहसील बैजनाथ, 5. मन्व देवी
पत्नी सुरेश मूढ व पत्नी सुरिन्द कुमार, बांसी पपराणा, 6. मधु देवी
पुत्री सुरिन्द कुमार पत्नी सुरेश कुमार, बांसी कोटल, तहसील बैजनाथ, 7. मनाजी देवी पुत्री सुरिन्द कुमार व पत्नी सुरेश कुमार, बांसी नन्वा,
जिला शिमला, 8. हिमाल देवी पत्नी सुरिन्द कुमार, बांसी पपराणा,
तहसील बैजनाथ, 9. विमला देवी विधवा पुत्र चन्द, बांसी पपराणा,
तहसील बैजनाथ, 10. पाना देवी मृतका के वारसान (i) अलय
कुमार पुत्र कम चन्द, गांव व डा० पपराणा, तहसील बैजनाथ,

11. चम्पा देवी मृतका के वारसान (i) चेतन उर्फ भाला राम
पुत्र प्यार चन्द, बांसी पपराणा, तहसील बैजनाथ, (ii) अलय कुमार
पुत्र कम चन्द, बांसी पपराणा, (iii) नवनीत कुमार पुत्र हेम राज,
बांसी राजपुर, तहसील पालमपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश,
12 प्यार चन्द मृतक के वारसान (i) चेतन उर्फ भाला राम पुत्र
प्यार चन्द, बांसी पपराणा, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)
13. हेम राज मृतक के वारसान (i) नवनीत पुत्र हेम राज,
बांसी राजपुर, तहसील पालमपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) 14. धनय
कुमार पुत्र कम चन्द, 15. मन्ना देवी पुत्री कम चन्द, 16. चेतन
उर्फ भाला राम पुत्र प्यार चन्द, सभी निवासीगण पपराणा, तहसील बैजनाथ,
17. ललित राज, 18. पिकु पुत्रान रतन चन्द, 19. चिप्या देवी पुत्री रतन
चन्द, 20. ललित देवी विधवा रतन चन्द सभी निवासीगण मनावना,
तहसील पालमपुर, 21. मृतक ज्ञान चन्द के वारसान (i) हरिण
चन्द पुत्र ज्ञान चन्द C/o ललित देवी, बांसी भवारना,
तहसील पालमपुर, 22. मृतका धनी देवी के वारसान (i) लोकार
चन्द मूढ, बांसी बल्ल, तहसील पालमपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश,
23. मृतका रामो देवी के वारसान (i) प्रभाद मूढ, बांसी राजपुरा
प्रत्यासीगण ।

तकसीम भूमि धारा नं० 118 वनीनी नं० 212, 213, 214,
215, 216, 217, धमरा 938, 1194, 1195, 1193, 1193,
931, 937, 1190, 1191, 1438/1091, 1140/1091, फिता
11, पठा 1-12-51 है०, मुहाल व भाजा पपराणा, तहसील
बैजनाथ ।

उपराक्त मुकरमा तकसीम में प्रतिवादीगण का इन न्यायालय द्वारा
समन जारी किए गए परन्तु तारीख न हो सकी। अतः इन न्यायालय
को यह विश्वास हो गया है कि उपराक्त प्रतिवादीगण की तारीख
माध्याह्न नतीका में नहीं हो सकी ।

इसीनए इन उपराक्त राजपूत द्वारा समस्त प्रतिवादीगण का सूचित
दिया जाता है कि वे धिका 15-5-2006 को इन मुकरमा की
पेरेवी हेतु अर्पितगत रूप से या किसी अधिवक्ता के माध्यम से इस
न्यायालय में उपस्थित आने अनिवार्य अनुपस्थिति की अवस्था में
नियमानुसार कार्यवाही समल में लाई जायेगी ।

मात्र दिनांक 31-3-2006 को मर हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अधालत
हारा जारी किया गया ।

माहर ।

रामजील,

महायक समाहता द्वितीय खेजी,
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

माहर ।

श्रीम राम भागडाव,
महायक समाहता द्वितीय खेजी एवं
कार्यकारी दण्डीधिकारी, फतेहपुर,
जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

अतः इन उपराक्त राजपूत हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा आम जनता
का सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति का मूल निवासी
पुत्री श्री मतीचन्द सिंह की जन्म तिथि 3-3-2006 का आम पचायत
हदवाल रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने में आपत्ति हो तो वह अनालतन
या बकालतन दिनांक 23-5-2006 का प्रातः 10.00 बजे होत्रि प्रकर
घपना एतगात्र पेज कर सकता है अन्यथा उक्त जन्म तिथि आम
पचायत हदवाल में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे ।

मात्र दिनांक 22-5-2006 को मर हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अधालत
में जारी हुआ ।

माहर ।

श्रीम चन्द ठाकुर
महायक समाहता प्रथम खेजी
एवं कार्यकारी दण्डीधिकारी, फतेहपुर,
जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब धराजित श्री बीर राम भागडाव, महायक समाहता द्वितीय खेजी
एवं कार्यकारी दण्डीधिकारी, फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

कम नं० 3/100

तारीख पेजा: 11-5-2006

श्री मेहर चन्द पुत्र श्री धम चन्द मा न मच्छाट, तहसील
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

प्राची ।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण ।

विषय प्राचीना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
धार्मिक, 1969

प्राची श्री मेहर चन्द पुत्र श्री धम चन्द मा न मच्छाट, तहसील
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा न प्राचीना-पत्र पेज किया है कि उसकी दादा
समशी देवा पत्नी श्री कथा राम की मृत्यु दिनांक 25-9-1982 का
गाम मच्छाट, तहसील फतेहपुर में हुई थी परन्तु इन तीनों मृत्यु तिथि
आम पचायत मच्छाट रिकार्ड में दर्ज न करवा सका है तथा दर्ज
करने का प्राचीना की है ।

अतः इन उपराक्त राजपूत, हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा आम जनता
का सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति के अनाजी देवी
पत्नी श्री कथा राम की मृत्यु दिनांक 25-9-1982 का आम
पचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने में आपत्ति हो तो वह अनालतन या
बकालतन दिनांक 11-5-2006 का मुहूर्त 10.00 बजे होत्रि प्रकर
घपना एतगात्र पेज कर सकता है अन्यथा उक्त मृत्यु तिथि आम
पचायत मच्छाट में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे ।

मात्र दिनांक 11-5-2006 को मर हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अधालत
में जारी हुआ ।

श्रीमती निमा देवी पत्नी श्री हाणिपार सिंह, निमासी गृहालय पुनर, मोहा पत्तन, महमीन मनाली, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कापीलय में प्रायश्चित्त किया है कि उसके लक्ष्य के प्रतीक मित्र का जन्म दिनांक 28-10-2000 को हुआ है मगर प्रायश्चित्त पुनर के प्रतिपक्ष में नहीं लड़ी है।

अन इस इन्फार्मर द्वारा मनेमापारण की सूचना किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किया व्यक्ति को कोई उत्तर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 18-5-2008 को सुबह 10-00 बजे समावन या नकावन हाजिर प्रभाव आकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। बाद मनेमापारण कोई भी उत्तर या एतराज काबिले समावन न होमा तथा प्रतीक मित्र पुनर श्री हाणिपार सिंह को जन्म तिथि 28-10-2000 के पंजीकरण आदेश मनेमापारण प्रभाव का पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आत दिनांक 13-4-2008 को मेरे इन्फार्मर व मोहर प्रभावत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

माहर । प्रकाश चन्द्र आचार्य,
नायक महमीनवार एवं कार्यकारी इन्फार्मर,
पानमापुर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व प्रभावत श्री प्रकाश सिंह ठाकुर, नायक महमीनवार एवं महमीन मनाली जिला पन्थी, उप-महमीन पुनर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

सूचना वकली नाम नं० 1/2008 जारीय पना 12-5-2008

श्री पन्थी राज उपनाम प्रणोक राज वमा पुनर श्री रिम्बा राम, निमासी गृहालय गाई, उप-महमीन पुनर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रार्थी।

बनाम
आम जनता

श्री प्रणोक राज उपनाम प्रणोक वमा, निमासी गृहालय गाई, मोहा व उप-महमीन पुनर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने प्रभावत में प्रार्थना पत्र मय प्रभाव वकली पत्र किया है कि उसका नाम राजपत्र व पंचायत अभिलेख आम पंचायत आना, उप-महमीन पुनर, जिला कांगडा में गनल वर्ज हुआ है। नाम की वकली राजपत्र अभिलेख व पंचायत अभिलेख में वकली करने का आदेश पारित किया जावे।

अन इस इन्फार्मर मनेमापारण द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उत्तर एवं एतराज प्रार्थी का राजपत्र अभिलेख व पंचायत अभिलेख में प्रणोक राज उपनाम प्रणोक राज वमा पुनर रिम्बा राम किये जाने बारे किसी व्यक्ति को हो तो वह तारीख पेशी 12-5-2008 को समावन या नकावन पत्र कर सकता है। बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किम्ब का उत्तर एवं एतराज नहीं मना जावेगा व नाम वकली का आदेश पारित कर दिया जावेगा।

यह इन्फार्मर मेरे इन्फार्मर व मोहर प्रभावत में आज दिनांक 12-4-2008 को जारी हुआ।

माहर । प्रकाश सिंह ठाकुर,
महायक मनाली द्वितीय पन्थी,
उप-महमीन पुनर, जिला कांगडा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व प्रभावत श्री इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज (एच०एच०एम०), उप-महमीन मीनस्टेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमता निमा देवी पत्नी स्वर्गीय श्री कुन्दन लाज, निमासी मनाली, नकावर छियाल, महमीन मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प०)।

बनाम
आम जनता

इन्फार्मर द्वारा आम को ज्ञात करने बारे।

श्रीमती निमा देवी पत्नी स्व० श्री कुन्दन लाज, निमासी मनाली, नकावर छियाल, महमीन मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कापीलय में प्रायश्चित्त पत्र किया है कि उसका नाम उसके पुत्र नम प्रमाण पुनर ने चन्दा देवी व परिहार रजिस्ट्रार माग-१ में निमा देवी लिखा गया है जो कि गलती है अतः चन्दा देवी में बदलकर निमा देवी दर्जित किया जाए।

अन इस प्रभावत इन्फार्मर द्वारा मनेमापारण की सूचना किया जाता है कि उत्तर प्रार्थी के नाम की गति में किसी को किसी प्रकार का कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 17-5-2008 को या इससे पूर्व इस नकावन में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पत्र कर सकता है प्रभावत उसका प्रार्थना के नाम गति हेतु आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आत दिनांक 18-4-2008 को मेरे इन्फार्मर व मोहर प्रभावत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

माहर । इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज,
उप-महमीन मीनस्टेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि०प०)।

व प्रभावत श्री इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज (एच०एच०एम०) उप-महमीन मीनस्टेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश

Miss Tenzin Tsekkyi d/o Sh Tsemphel, r/o Gompa Road Manali, Tehsil Manali

बनाम
आम जनता
विषय प्रार्थना इन्फार्मर बाबत जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण हेतु आग 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

Miss Tenzin Tsekkyi पत्नी श्री Tsemphel, निमासी गोम्पा रोड मनाली, महमीन मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कापीलय में प्रायश्चित्त पत्र मय प्रायश्चित्त पुनर है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 28-3-1981 को हुआ है परन्तु उसकी जन्म तिथि तगर पंचायत मनाली के रिकार्ड में वन न की गई है। जिसे अब दर्ज करवाने के आदेश दिए जायेंगे।

अन मनेमापारण को इस इन्फार्मर द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को Tenzin Tsekhi की जन्म तिथि वन करवाने बारे प्रार्थना हो तो वह दिनांक 17-5-2008 को या इससे पूर्व प्रभावत द्वारा मेरे प्रायश्चित्त दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरांत कोई भी उत्तर/एतराज समावन न होमा तथा निमापुनर जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे।

आत दिनांक 18-4-2008 को मेरे इन्फार्मर व मोहर प्रभावत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

माहर । इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज,
उप-महमीन मीनस्टेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व प्रभावत श्री इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज (एच०एच०एम०) उप-महमीन मीनस्टेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश

Sh Penma Tsetan s/o Sh. Rigyal Chering, r/o Gompa Road Manali, Tehsil Manali, District Kullu (H P).

बनाम
आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इस्तहार बाबत जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

Sh. Pema Tsetan पुत्र श्री Rigyal Chering, निवासी गोम्पा रोड मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री दिनांक 7-8-2001 को पैदा हुई है परन्तु उसकी जन्म तिथि नगर पंचायत मनाली के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न की गई है । जिसे धब दर्ज करवाने के आदेश दिए जावे ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को Tsering Dolma की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 17-5-2006 को या इससे पूर्व प्रदात हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है । इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एनराज ममायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे ।

प्राज दिनांक 18-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदात द्वारा जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज,
उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, मनाली,
जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज (एच0 ए0 एस0), उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश

Sh Pema Tsetan s/o Sh. Rigyal Chering,
r/o Gompa Road Manali, Tehsil Manali,
District Kullu (H. P.).

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इस्तहार बाबत जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण जेर द्वारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

Sh Pema Tsetan पुत्र श्री Rigyal Chering, निवासी गोम्पा रोड मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री दिनांक 2-12-1998 को पैदा हुई है परन्तु उसकी जन्म तिथि नगर पंचायत मनाली के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न की गई है । जिसे धब दर्ज करवाने के आदेश दिए जावे ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को Yeshe Dolma की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 17-5-2006 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है । इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर व एनराज ममायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे ।

प्राज दिनांक 18-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदात द्वारा जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज,
उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट,
मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) ।

व अदालत श्री इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज (एच0 ए0 एस0), उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)

Sh Pema Tsetan s/o Sh. Rigyal Chering,
r/o Gompa Road, Manali, Tehsil Manali,
District Kullu (H. P.).

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इस्तहार बाबत जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण जेर द्वारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

Sh. Pema Tsetan पुत्र Sh. Rigyal Chering, निवासी गोम्पा रोड, मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री दिनांक 30-7-1998 को पैदा हुई है परन्तु उसकी जन्म तिथि नगर पंचायत मनाली के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न की गई है । जिसे धब दर्ज करवाने के आदेश दिये जावे ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को Kunchok Dolma की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 17-5-2006 को या इससे पूर्व प्रदात हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है । इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर व एनराज ममायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे ।

प्राज दिनांक 18-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदात द्वारा जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज,
उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, मनाली,
जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज (एच0 ए0 एस0), उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश

Sh Pema Chetan s/o Sh. Rigyal Chering, r/o
Gompa Road, Manali, Tehsil Manali, District
Kullu (H. P.).

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इस्तहार बाबत जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

Sh. Pema Chetan s/o Sh. Rigyal Chering, निवासी गोम्पा रोड मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन-पत्र मय शपथ-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका पुत्र दिनांक 22-5-2003 को पैदा हुआ है परन्तु उसकी जन्म तिथि नगर पंचायत मनाली के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न की गई है । जिसे धब दर्ज करवाने के आदेश दिये जावे ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को Karma Chomphel की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 17-5-2006 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है । इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एनराज ममायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 18-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज,
उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, मनाली,
जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

य अदालत श्री इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज (एचओ एओएमओ), उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश

Sh. Samga s/o Sh Namga, r/o H. No. 27, Ward No 7, Gompa Road Manali, Tehsil Manali, District Kullu (H P).

बनम

अम जनता

विषय—प्रकाशन इन्हार बाबत जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

Sh. Samga पुत्र Sh. Namga, निवासी H. No. 27, Ward No 7, गोम्पा रोड मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन-पत्र मय जपथ-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पत्नी दिनांक 1-3-1988 को पैदा हुई है परन्तु उसकी जन्म तिथि नगर पंचायत मनाली के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न की गई है। जिसे अब दर्ज करवाने के आदेश दिये जाते हैं।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इन्हार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को Dawa Dolma की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 17-5-2006 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हज़ा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतगरज समाप्त न होगा तथा नियमानुसार जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 18-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

इन्द्र सिंह भारद्वाज,
उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, मनाली,
जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

In the Court of Sh. B. S. Dehal, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sadar Sub Division Mandi, District Mandi (H P.)

In the matter of:—

1. Sh. Pranav Chandel s/o Sh. Shiv Kumar Chandel, r/o Village and P. O. Ner Chowk, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh.
2. Smt. Shalika Chandel d/o Shri H. S. Sen, r/o H. No. 48/5, Hari Puri Colony, Sundernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh

.. Applicants.

Versus

General public

Subject.—Application for the registration of Marriage under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Sh. Pranav Chandel and Smt. Shalika Chandel have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 that they have solemnized their marriage on 10-8-2005 at Village and P. O. Ner Chowk, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh and they are living together as husband and wife since then, hence

their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 16-5-2006 after that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered.

Issued on 19th April, 2006 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

B. S. DEHAL,
Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sadar Sub-Division Mandi,
Himachal Pradesh.

न्यायालय कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, सरकाषाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा शीर्षक :

श्री बनदेव सिंह पुत्र श्री बालक राम, निवासी चेन, डाकघर रोपड़ी, तहसील सरकाषाट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०) ... प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

... करीबदीयम।

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी श्री बनदेव सिंह ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3) पेश किया है कि उसकी मां श्रीमती भागवत देवी विप्रवा श्री पंजका, निवासी चेन की दिनांक 15-11-2005 को मृत्यु हो गई थी जिसे पंचायत गिरकंड में दर्ज नहीं कराया गया है।

अतः ग्राम जनता को इस इन्हार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज होने वाले किसी का कोई उजर या एतगरज हो तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा उक्त तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 12-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सरकाषाट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)।

न्यायालय श्री नूदामणी, उप-पञ्जीकाछस, सरकाषाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा शीर्षक :

सर्वश्री कृष्ण दयाल पुत्र गोकल, बनबौर सिंह, पवन कुमार पुत्र बकरी राम, निवासी गांव कांगो-का-गहरा, ईलाका घननपुर, तहसील सरकाषाट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०) ... प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

... करीबदीयम।

प्रार्थना-पत्र बाबत किए जाने पंजीकृत बसीयतनामा अधीन धारा 40 तथा 41.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थीगणों ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र बगए पंजीयन बसीयतनामा जो मनीकी मन्तु पुत्र गोकल, निवासी कांगो-का-गहरा ने उनके नाम तहरीर करवाया है, पेश किया है। बसीयतनामा दिनांक 15-2-2006 को स्वर्ग विधाय चुका है।

घन: करीब दोसम घाम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त बसीयत पंजीयन होने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 12-5-2006 का या इससे पूर्व इस न्यायालय में पेश करे। अनुपस्थिति की सूचना में कार्यवाही एक पक्षीय प्रमन में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 12-4-2006 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अभावत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

बुधामणी,
उप-पंजीकाध्यक्ष,
सरकाषाट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)।

न्यायालय श्री बुधामणी, महायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, सरकाषाट,
जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा शीर्षक :

श्री रतन चन्द पुत्र श्री भगत राम, निवासी बडरेगा, डाकघर
बाग, तहसील सरकाषाट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०) प्राणी।

बनाम

घाम जनता करीब दोसम।

प्राथना पत्र दस्तवी नाम, मुहाल बैरी/बडरेगा।

प्राणी श्री रतन चन्द पुत्र श्री भगत राम, निवासी बडरेगा,
ने इस न्यायालय में प्राथना-पत्र पेश किया है कि उसका सही
नाम रतन चन्द है जो स्कूल तथा सविम रिकार्ड में सही दर्ज है
परन्तु राजस्व रिकार्ड मुहाल बैरी/बडरेगा में यह गलती से फागण
दर्ज हुआ है।

घन: घाम जनता को बखरिया इशतहार सूचित किया जाता है
कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त नाम दस्तवी बारे कोई एतराज
हो तो वह दिनांक 12-5-2006 या इससे पूर्व इस न्यायालय
में पेश करे। अनुपस्थिति की सूचना में कार्यवाही एकपक्षीय
प्रमन में लाई जाएगी।

मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अभावत से आज दिनांक 12-4-2006 को
जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

बुधामणी,
महायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सरकाषाट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)।

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF
HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
COMPANY PETITION NO. 5 OF 2006

In the matter of Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956)

And

In the matter of Section 391 & 394 of the Companies
Act, 1956.

And

In the matter of Scheme of Amalgamation of
Shivalik Hatcheries Private Limited with Venkatesh-
wara Hatcheries Private Limited a Company incorpo-
rated under the provisions of Companies Act, 1956
having its registered office at Venkateshwara House,
H. No. 3-5-808 & 808/1, Hyderguda, Hyderabad
500 054.

Shivalik Hatcheries Private Limited, a Company
Incorporated under the provisions of Companies
Act, 1956 having its registered office at Village Pater
Bhanku, P.O. Panjhora, Tehsil Nalagarh, District
Solan in the State of Himachal Pradesh. ... Applicant.

A Petition under Section 394 of the Companies Act,
1956 for Sanctioning the Scheme of Amalgamation of
Shivalik Hatcheries Private Limited, the Petitioner
Company with Venkateshwara Hatcheries Private
Limited, the Transferee Company, was presented by the
Petitioner Company on 1st day of April, 2006 and the
same has been admitted on 7th day of April, 2006. The
said Petition is fixed for hearing before the Company
Judge on 29th day of May, 2006 at 11 O'clock in the
forenoon.

Any person desirous of supporting or opposing the
said Petition should send to the Petitioner's Advocate
not later than 4 days before the date of hearing of
Petition, where he seeks to oppose the Petition, the
grounds of opposing or a copy of the affidavit should be
furnished with such notice.

A copy of the Petition will be furnished by the under-
signed to any person requiring the same on payment of
prescribed charges for the same.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (Judicial)
High Court of H. P.
Shimla.

Sd/-
ATUL JHANGRA,
Advocate,
75, the Mal Shimla,
Himachal Pradesh.

Shimla, the 24th April, 2006.

ब अदालत श्री आ० पी० ठाकुर, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
रेणुका जी स्थित संगडाह, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)

मिसल नं० : 1/04

तारीख मरजुआ : 2-1-2004

धर्म चन्द पुत्र श्री रिखी राम घाई, निवासी मोहनू, तहसील रेणुका
जी, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०) ... सायलान।

बनाम

सही राम पुत्र पगल उर्फ जालम, निवासी मोहनू, तहसील रेणुका जी,
जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०) आदि ... श्रीकसानियान।

दस्तावेज तरीका तकसीम भूमि खाता खतौनी नं० 20/31 ता
39 तादादी 557-4 बीघा बाका रकबा मीजा मोहनू, तहसील
रेणुकाजी, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा तरीका तकसीम भूमि अदालत हजा में जेरे
गोर है तथा त्रिममें, 1. रूप सिंह पुत्र सायक, निवासी बावनल,
तहसील रेणुका जी, 2. कुन्दन सिंह, नैनसिंह पुत्रान केहर, निवासी
बावनल, 3. बैला राम, दया राम, भगवान सिंह पुत्रान सगाना, निवासी
बावनल, 4. जीत राम पुत्र कुशन सिंह, निवासी बावनल, 5. श्याम
चन्द पुत्र रिखी राम, निवासी ददाहू (फौत) जायज वारिस प्रेमदत्त
पुत्र श्याम चन्द, निवासी ददाहू, शोम प्रकाश, रमेश पुत्रान श्याम चन्द,
निवासी चयाना/ददाहू, 6. पूर्ण चन्द, कुलानन्द पुत्रान उदय राम,
निवासी मोहनू, 7. भज्ज पुत्र चान्दन् (फौत), निवासी रजाना
जायज वारिस महेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र, जमनी विधवा व सत्या पुत्री
भज्ज. निवासी रजाना/गनंग, 8. जागर सिंह पुत्र बली राम
निवासी शामरा हाल निवासी लोहारा टिकरी, तहसील रेणुकाजी,
अनंग पुत्री बली राम, निवासी शामरा, 9. राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र सुरत
राम, निवासी लोहारा टिकरी, 10. रतन सिंह पुत्र चादन् (फौत),
जायज वारिस लोको देवी विधवा, कुमारी गीता पुत्री रतन सिंह,
निवासी रजाना, तहसील रेणुका जी, 11. श्यामा पुत्री रतन सिंह, निवासी
अद. तहसील रेणुकाजी, 12. धर्म मजनों, मुन्नी पुत्रियां बस्ती
राम, निवासी शामरा/उंगरकण्डो, तहसील रेणुकाजी, 13. जगू पुत्र
अमर सिंह, निवासी अजरी, तहसील रेणुकाजी, 14. नारदा, शारदा,
मधुबाना पुत्रियां राम दाम, निवासी मोहनू, 15. पदमा, लक्ष्मी, तारी
पुत्रियां धोंकया, निवासी चांदनी/हालपलारा/काळरिध, 16. रामचन्द्र
पुत्र सायक, निवासी मोहनू, तहसील रेणुकाजी, जिला सिरमौर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश को श्रीकसानियान बताया गया है। अदालत द्वारा
बार-बार समन जारी करते पर भी इन्हें तामील नहीं हो रही है
जिनसे अदालत को पूरा यकीन हो चका है कि उन्हें जब साधारण
तरीक में तामील नहीं करवाई जा सकती।

अतः इस अदालती इन्तहार के माध्यम से फरीकमानियान उपरोक्त को सूचित किया जाता है कि वे अगर मुकद्दमा उपरोक्त तरीका तकसीम में अपना उजर/एतराज पेश करना चाहें तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को अमानतन/वकालतन अदालत में हाजिर आकर अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकते हैं। बाद गुजरने के बाद कार्यवाही करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 20-4-2006 को हमारे हुस्ताअर व मोहर अदालत में जारी किया गया।

मोहर।
श्री 0 पी 0 ठाकुर,
सहायक सदाशती प्रथम श्रेणी,
रेणुका जी स्थित संगरहाट, जिला मिरमोर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री जी 0 एम 0 चोपड़ा, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा माहिब, जिला मिरमोर (हि 0 प्र 0)

श्री रघुबीर चन्द पुत्र श्री मृगत चन्द शर्मा, निवासी माजरा, तहसील पांवटा माहिब, जिला मिरमोर (हि 0 प्र 0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री रघुबीर चन्द पुत्र श्री मृगत चन्द शर्मा, निवासी माजरा, तहसील पांवटा माहिब, जिला मिरमोर (हि 0 प्र 0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत करके प्रार्थना की है कि उनकी माता श्रीमती गीता देवी जिनकी मृत्यु तिथि 22-10-2003 है, की मृत्यु तिथि ग्राम पंचायत माजरा के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करवाई गई है। जिसे प्रार्थी अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इन्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा मिति 17-5-2006 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में उपस्थित आकर प्रस्तुत करे, वरन्त हीनर श्रीमती मीता देवी पत्नी श्री मृगत चन्द शर्मा की मृत्यु तिथि 22-10-2003 को दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 17-4-2006 को मेरे हुस्ताअर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
जी 0 एम 0 चोपड़ा,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
पांवटा माहिब, जिला मिरमोर (हि 0 प्र 0)।

व अदालत श्री रोहित जमवाल, उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट प्रकी, जिला मोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री देवी चन्द सपुत्र श्री मस्त राम, निवासी ग्राम खाजला, हाकसर दानोघाट, तहसील प्रकी, जिला मोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

प्रार्थी उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसकी लड़की उमा कुमार का जन्म दिनांक 16-10-2000 को हुआ था लेकिन ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में उसका नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं है। अब दर्ज किये जाने के आदेश जारी किये जायेंगे।

अतः इस इन्तहार राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी व्यक्ति को

कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 17-5-2006 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अमानतन या वकालतन उपस्थित आकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। बाद गुजरने के बाद कार्यवाही करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 17-4-2006 को हमारे हुस्ताअर व मोहर अदालत में जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
रोहित जमवाल,
उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट,
प्रकी, जिला मोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि 0 प्र 0)

व मुकद्दमा : जन्म प्रमाण-पत्र।

रजनी देवी बनाम ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्रीमती रजनी देवी पत्नी श्री रजिन्द्र कुमार, निवासी गांव जलघाट टब्बा, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसके पुत्र राजकिशोर मिश्र का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जावे। उसके पुत्र का नाम राजकिशोर मिश्र है, जन्म तिथि 6-10-2003 तथा बच्चे का जन्म स्थान जलघाट टब्बा है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सम्मन जनता तथा सम्बन्धी रिजिस्ट्रारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त बच्चे का नाम दर्ज होने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे स्वयं अथवा अमानतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के आदेश दे दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 2-5-2006 को हुस्ताअर मेरे व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।
हुस्ताअर/-
नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

बालकिशन बनाम ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री बालकिशन पुत्र श्री बेनी राम, निवासी गांव रायपुर, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसके पुत्र अक्षय राणा का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जावे। उसके पुत्र का नाम अक्षय राणा है, जन्म तिथि 25-5-2000 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म स्थान रायपुर है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सम्मन जनता तथा सम्बन्धी रिजिस्ट्रारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त बच्चे का नाम दर्ज होने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक

15-5-2006 को प्रातः दस बजे स्वयं अथवा अधालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 12-4-2006 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)।

ब अधालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील
व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती दनीषा

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दख्खास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
प्रधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्रीमती दनीषा पत्नी श्री नरिन्द्र कुमार, निवासी गांव रायसरी, तहसील ऊना, जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दख्खास्त दी है कि उसके पुत्र मनीष का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है। अथ दर्ज करवाया जावे। उसके पुत्र का नाम मनीष है, जन्म तिथि 28-12-2000 तथा बचन का जन्म स्थान गांव बसोली है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धी रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त बच्चे का नाम दर्ज होने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 15-5-2006 को सुबह 10.00 बजे स्वयं अथवा अधालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 13-4-2006 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)।

भाग 6—भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन

-शून्य-

भाग 7—भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं

-शून्य-

अनुपूरक

-शून्य-